



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JUNE 11, 2019

No. 97

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VEASEY).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
June 11, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARC A. VEASEY to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

HONORING ALLEN PINGEE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and service of Allen "Al" Pingee of Lewis Run. Al passed away on Tuesday, April 23, at his home, surrounded by his family.

Al was a McKean County commissioner at the time of his death, and I flew a flag over the United States Capitol to be presented to Al's family and his colleagues.

Prior to becoming a commissioner, Al was a member of the city of Bradford professional firefighters and retired as a captain in 1988. He then served as Bradford Township supervisor for 14 years, 11 of those years as chairman.

Al was a proud Vietnam veteran. He enlisted in the U.S. Marine Corps and was honorably discharged as a corporal in September 1970.

Mr. Speaker, Al Pingee has served his Nation and his community.

Above all else, he was a family man, a loving husband of 36 years to his wife, Deborah, and father to his four children, Andy, Scott, Jeff, and Jodie. He was a grandfather, a brother, and a friend to many.

We remember Al Pingee for his exceptional service to others.

May he rest in peace.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL DAIRY MONTH

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize June as National Dairy Month.

Dairy products like milk contain nine essential nutrients that may help reduce the risk for high blood pressure, osteoporosis, and certain cancers. Whether it is a protein to help build and repair the muscle tissue of active bodies or Vitamin A to help maintain healthy skin, dairy products are a natural nutrient powerhouse.

National Dairy Month started out as National Milk Month in 1937 to stabilize the dairy demand when the production was at a surplus. Now, it has developed into an annual tradition that celebrates the contributions the dairy industry has made to the world.

Proudly, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania is one of the largest milk-producing States in the Nation. I have a bill called the Whole Milk for Healthy Kids Act, which would allow for whole milk, both flavored and nonflavored, to be offered in school cafeterias.

Just last week, I introduced the School Milk Nutrition Act with Con-

gressman JOE COURTNEY to expand milk options for students and reverse the decline of milk consumption in our schools. Our bill reaffirms recent regulation from the U.S. Department of Agriculture by providing schools with the option to serve low-fat milk with flavor and requires that the milk offered is consistent with the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans.

In November 2017, the U.S. Department of Agriculture announced regulatory changes for the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Programs, including a provision that provides schools with the option to serve low-fat 1 percent flavored milk.

The School Milk Nutrition Act for 2019 will codify this milk provision and will maintain the option for schools to offer low-fat 1 percent flavored milk if it is consistent with the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans.

I urge my colleagues to sign on to these bills during National Dairy Month and allow our students the option of consuming the type of milk that they love and to receive the nutrition that they need.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to being, a week from today, in our State capital of Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, at 11 a.m. for a rally with all the advocates for nutrition for children and certainly for dairy farming, as we rally for whole milk for healthy kids.

HONORING AVANT P. COLEMAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of a great public servant, a father, a dedicated man of faith, a friend to many, and the longest-serving elected official in Wilson, North Carolina, city government, the Honorable Avant Patrick Coleman.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4393

Avant Coleman, Mr. Speaker, better known as A.P., is a native of Edgecombe County, but he has resided in Wilson County for many decades. He received his formal education, earning his bachelor of science degree in agriculture and biology from historic North Carolina A&T State University. He went on to earn a master of science degree in adult education with a minor in sociology from North Carolina State University and a graduate of the Extension Executive Development Institute.

Professionally, A.P. used the full potential of his education and passion in his career, which began with teaching vocational agriculture in Lenoir and Greene Counties. His desire to pour into our youth a conviction for community engagement led him to join the North Carolina Cooperative Extension Service, where he worked for 31 long years, retiring in March 1994. In this role, Mr. Speaker, he was responsible for countywide 4-H programs, a national initiative that embraces young people of all beliefs and all backgrounds and empowers them with leadership skills training for the betterment of their lives and their communities.

A.P. Coleman has earned numerous distinctions, honors, and achievements. Elected in 1975, A.P. Coleman has served for 38 long years as a member of the Wilson City Council. He served as mayor pro tempore from 1989 to 1995.

His campaign slogan embodied his mantra of service to the community to improve the lives of its people. He would say, "A new way for a new day." His early platform for service included economic and business development, balanced growth, housing, crime and violence, and most importantly, contact with citizens.

His retirement from elected office was effective a few days ago on 31 May 2019.

A.P. Coleman has served on several council-appointed boards and committees throughout the State and the city, such as president of the North Carolina League of Municipalities, 1991 to 1992; chairman of Region L Council of Governments, 1990 to 1992, 2006 to 2007; a member of the Small Cities Council and National League of Cities, 1988 to 1995.

He has served on the board of directors for Carolina Family Health Centers, Incorporated. That is our FQHC in the city. He served as director since 1999 and even served as chairman.

Mr. Coleman previously served as a board member for the local and regional Nations Bank and was the recipient of many leadership awards, including the Extension Service Superior Leadership Award. He received a certificate of appreciation after completing a 4-H caravan 6-week study tour of the United Kingdom, honoring his leadership roles in the States of Maryland and North Carolina.

He has served, Mr. Speaker, as finance committee chair for Carolina

Smart Choices for Youth and as a chairman of the Wilson Preparatory Academy charter school.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Coleman has been a very engaged individual for decades. Throughout his years of public service, A.P. Coleman has been active with his local church, civic affairs, and other charitable organizations. He is a member of Calvary Presbyterian Church, U.S.A., where he serves as an elder. He is a past member of the board of directors for United Way, president of the Wilson County chapter of the North Carolina A&T State University Alumni Association, vice president of Crime Stoppers, past member of the Eastern North Carolina School for the Deaf's human rights committee, member of the Presbytery of the New Hope disaster committee, and recipient of prestigious accomplishments and awards.

Coleman is also a proud member of Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity and a life member of the NAACP.

The most important thing to Avant Coleman has always been his family. He was married to the late Willa Monroe Coleman and is the proud father of three, Elliotte, Wanda, and Jacqueline, and a proud grandfather of one grandson, Juan.

Avant is a family man, dear friend, and colleague to so many others. Mr. Speaker, he is also my neighbor, my next-door neighbor for the past 25 years. A man of principle and conviction to the importance of brotherly kindness, A.P.'s motto in life is the golden rule: "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

Finally, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Coleman has lived an incredible life that, by the grace of God, has impacted the lives of so many. His selfless and lifelong dedication to public service and community are beyond remarkable, and he is truly a role model. His love for his family, friends, church, and community know no bounds.

I am honored today to pay tribute to such a dedicated and honorable public servant. I am proud to have A.P. Coleman as a constituent and friend. I thank him for his dedication, service, and continued role as an inspiration to all of us. God continue to bless A.P. Coleman and his family.

HONORING JANIE L. MINES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to recognize one of the most accomplished constituents in the Fifth District of South Carolina.

Janie L. Mines, who lives in Fort Mill, encompasses what it means to serve and honor one's country. In 1975, after the United States Congress authorized the entrance of women into our first-rate military service academies, Janie soon applied to enter the United States Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland.

Out of 81 women who entered the academy in 1976, Ms. Mines was the first and only Black woman to graduate from her class and the first ever Black woman to graduate from the United States Naval Academy as a whole.

After her departure from the academy with the rank of ensign and a bachelor of science in engineering, Ms. Mines was trained as a supply officer and became a supervisor at the former Naval Training Center in Orlando, Florida. She proceeded to serve in the former Naval Annex at the Pentagon, aboard the USS *Emory S. Land*, and as a senior adviser to the Secretary of the Navy. In fact, she has continued her work in the Armed Forces on the Defense Advisory Committee on Women.

Her exceptional accomplishments include being granted the position of torchbearer for the 2002 Olympic Games, starting a foundation that tends to the needs of socioeconomically disadvantaged boys, and being honored by the United States Navy with a business achievement award in 2010.

In 2018, Ms. Mines wrote and published the book "No Coincidences: Reflections of the First Black Female Graduate of the United States Naval Academy." In it, she shows us the true meaning of faith, patriotism, and persistence. We can all learn from her story and her deep love of this country.

I will end with a quote from her book: "God has a plan for us all. If we submit to His will, we need not fear. We are prepared and protected."

We thank Ms. Mines for her continued service to this great country.

HONORING SOUTHSIDE FIRE DEPARTMENT

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise in honor of the 50th anniversary of the Southside Fire Department on March 19.

The fully volunteer fire department has protected the people and property of Union County since 1974 when the first call rang. The station has grown from as little as five calls a year to 98 calls in 2018 alone.

The foundation of Southside Fire Department was a community effort. The seed was planted in 1969 when a meeting was held at Roper Chevrolet to hear the public's opinion on the organization of a fire district for the local area in Union County.

However, it was not until 1972 that Southside received its first truck and could finally open its station. Supported by the local community's generosity, the fire department established itself and eventually joined South Carolina's Firefighters Association.

For almost 50 years now, Southside Volunteer Fire Department has fought fires to protect the great folks in the district. The station currently has an ISO Class 3/9 rating and serves over 3,500 residents.

As a Nation, we ask much of our citizens. Yet, even on top of the burdens and the toil of everyday life, some

choose to volunteer to save the lives and property of their neighbors. With nothing to gain and everything to lose, they head straight toward danger.

I congratulate the fire chief, Michael Lancaster, and the rest of the crew at Southside Fire Department on this incredible milestone. We thank them for their tireless, continued service to our community and our great Nation.

HONORING OTIS WASHINGTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and legacy of the late Coach Otis Washington.

A native of Selma, Alabama, Coach Washington was a legendary Louisiana Football Hall of Famer who instilled in his players his winning spirit, strong character, and quest for excellence.

□ 1015

Sadly, Coach Washington passed away on Friday, May 24, 2019, at the age of 80.

Coach Washington was born on February 12, 1939, in Selma, Alabama, to Sadie and Otis Washington, Sr. He graduated from R.B. Hudson High School in 1957, where he was class president and a star athlete. He then graduated from Xavier University in New Orleans, where he was captain of the football team and an all-conference guard and linebacker.

Coach Washington's resume speaks for itself. As the head football coach, he led St. Augustine High School in New Orleans, Louisiana, to three State championships and, in his 11 seasons there, he guided the Purple Knights to 11 consecutive winning seasons and seven district titles.

In 1979, Coach Washington became the first African American football coach at LSU when he joined the staff as offensive line coach. Later, Coach Washington was hired as the head football coach at Southern University, where he led the Jaguars for six seasons.

Because of his many outstanding football achievements, Coach Washington was inducted into the Louisiana Sports Hall of Fame in 2015 and the St. Augustine Hall of Fame in 2017, among many, many other honors.

His success on the football field was matched by his many efforts in the community to promote fairness, equity, and justice. Coach Washington was a key figure in integrating the Louisiana High School Athletic Association.

While Coach Washington was often quick to downplay his role in integrating the league, he did so as a humble man who knew his place, but, more importantly, knew that his place was rising above the stars and making sure that his players knew that they were just as good, if not better, than any other player on the field.

Coach Washington was a devout Catholic and a devoted member of the Immaculate Conception Catholic Church in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. His devotion to his faith began as a young boy in Selma, Alabama, where he was a member of the Don Bosco Catholic Boys Club, founded by Father Nelson Ziter in 1947.

He was also a devout husband to his wife of 52 years, Linda Patterson Washington of Baton Rouge, Louisiana, whom he met while coaching at St. Augustine. He is also survived by his siblings, Carol, Olivia, Charlene, Theopolis, Sharon, and Irma; and many godchildren, special grandchildren, as well as nieces, nephews, relatives, and friends. They will all miss him dearly.

On a personal note, I knew this amazing man as my "Uncle Otis." He was one of my father's childhood best friends growing up in Selma, Alabama. Uncle Otis, my dad, Charles Williams, and Ted Washington referred to themselves as the "Four Amigos" in grammar school, a name that stuck with them throughout their lives. These men never forgot the lessons that they learned from Father Ziter at the Don Bosco Boys Club in Selma. Their love for their hometown of Selma and their commitment to service through sports will always be remembered.

Uncle Otis and Auntie Linda were a constant presence in the lives of my twin brothers and myself. I could always count on them for words of encouragement and boasts of pride on my many accomplishments. I know that I stand today as Alabama's first Black congresswoman because of the love, support, nurturing, and prayers of the mentors, family, and friends like Uncle Otis and Auntie Linda.

Like my dad, Uncle Otis will be missed but never forgotten. The legacy that Uncle Otis leaves behind will live on in the many lives that he impacted. May we find comfort in knowing that his legend lives in us, and we are stronger and better because Uncle Otis' light shines bright within us.

On behalf of Alabama's Seventh Congressional District, I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the extraordinary life and legacy of Selma's own Coach Otis Washington, a football coaching legend and Louisiana hall-of-famer. May we celebrate the totality of his life today and honor always his great accomplishments in sports and contributions in shaping the hearts, minds, and character of many men.

IT IS TIME TO MOVE ON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, while the Judiciary Committee should be focused on securing the borders and overhauling a very broken immigration system, they, instead, bring a clown and circus show to town.

When I looked up yesterday and saw John Dean, it took me back to the hot

summer of 1974, when we saw John Dean and his cohorts on our television screens for days at a time. In an era with only three television stations—that is right, Mr. Speaker, we only had three stations growing up—Mr. Dean was on all three of them for hours at a time, for days on end.

Bringing another convicted felon, and a biased one at that, a person who has tweeted 970 times anti-Trump propaganda, to bring this criminal to these Chambers was yet another embarrassment to the majority party. All of America realizes the Democratic leadership has dug a deep, deep hole for itself and, for all practical purposes, has started this impeachment process and hearings. Nevertheless, in contradiction to public wishes, it appears the Judiciary chairman will continue to dig a deeper hole by calling such a slanderous, offensive witness and move forward with impeachment.

After doing over 38 townhalls across the State of Kansas since January, everywhere I go, folks tell me the same thing: It is time to move on.

Mr. Speaker, we have real problems that need to be addressed. My folks back home are dealing with floods and tornadoes. The farmers can't get their crops in the field, and China and the European Union are blocking us from exporting our commodities. All these things are things we cannot control. We have enough problems without the Washington swamp adding to our misery.

Folks back home want our border secured. They want a fair, streamlined immigration system, which helps fill the 70,000 open jobs we have across the State. From agriculture, to the aircraft industry, to high-tech jobs, Mr. Speaker, we need more people who are able and willing to work. And we all know this immigration reform is exactly what the Judiciary Committee should be taking up as we speak. Instead of fixing real problems, the Democrat-controlled House just keeps digging deeper down this false impeachment hole they have initiated.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stop and applaud the President for his most recent efforts to secure our borders. As we all know, over the course of less than 2 weeks—record time for diplomacy in this age—the President was able to leverage potential tariffs into real action by the Mexican government. That is right, real action with real results.

Thanks to these efforts, Mexico is going to place 6,000 new troops to control their southern border. Additionally, Mexico has agreed to shelter, feed, and help those who apply for asylum in this country. This all matters to Kansans, and we thank the President for his efforts.

This is huge. How huge is it? Well, I have been to the border, almost a year ago now, and I know a crisis when I see it. It was a crisis then and, by all measures, this crisis has literally doubled.

Every day, on average, we are now apprehending almost 5,000 people crossing the border illegally. We are housing, feeding, and providing healthcare to over 40,000 people daily. We literally have run out of bed space. We now have over 900,000 people waiting for asylum hearings, of which only 10 percent have a legitimate claim.

Even in the words of the most liberal of newspapers, the New York Times agrees this is a crisis: "While lawmakers wring their hands and drag their feet, tens of thousands of migrant children are suffering."

"Congress needs to get serious about dealing with that suffering."

Mr. Speaker, it is a shame that Congress won't do its job, that we won't secure the border, and that we won't overhaul a broken immigration system. Instead, the Democrats drive the agenda that started, for all practical purposes, an agenda that brings in the ghost of Christmas past, a convicted liar and felon, as their star witness for impeachment hearings.

Mr. Speaker, I continue to learn lessons about leadership. Leaders must at times endure criticism and attacks and stay the course. Leaders keep their word, they demand results, and they hold people accountable. Leaders keep the ship moving into high headwinds. Leaders think outside the box. They use the tools given them. They don't make excuses. They never, never give up. Somehow, they always bring the light back to the objective, the goal at hand. When others won't lift, they lift the entire weight. They show the path, they shine the light, and they go first when others are afraid. Leaders don't repeat the mistakes of those who went before them over and over again.

Mr. Speaker, great leaders all have their own unique style. One of my heroes was President General Dwight David Eisenhower, who was a visionary, able to move pieces around for the D-day invasion, but also had the vision to see the need for an interstate highway system, a space program, and civil rights.

Another hero of mine is John Wayne's Rooster Cogburn, the mythical marshal from the movie "True Grit," who often, when he couldn't get people to follow, well, I guess I would say, he just ran over them.

Mr. Speaker, I thank our President for showing us what true leadership looks like, and what true grit looks like in real time, in real life.

Mr. Speaker, we need the President to keep leading.

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to read a letter from my constituent, Pastor Dr. Ronald S. Williams.

Mr. Williams writes: "A mobster, con man, gangster in the White House? I think so."

"This past week, Special Counsel Robert Mueller gave a verbal synopsis of his 2-year investigative report. He is quoted as saying: 'If we had confidence that the President clearly did not commit a crime, we would have said so.' He also said: 'The Constitution requires a process other than the criminal justice system to formally accuse a sitting President of wrongdoing.'"

"This process would be impeachment. The question is, why hasn't the United States Congress started a formal impeachment investigation?"

"In our Nation's Pledge of Allegiance, we state that the United States of America is 'one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.' Many of us have been taught to recite this pledge since elementary school. Today's society compels one to ask the question: Are we truly one nation under God?"

"NANCY PELOSI is a woman who I respect. However, I do believe her hesitancy to impeach this President is her opinion, based upon polls and her belief that it would further polarize the country. However, the country is already divided and polarized, which can be greatly contributed to the madness of the present executive administration of the country."

"As a pastor, a father, a grandfather, and a friend of many, my answer to this question is, no, we are not."

"I recently engaged in a conversation with a pastor's wife who resided in the small community that I attended graduate school. I knew the town was small and malignant with bigotry, ignorance, and racism. As we conversed, I discovered that she, too, was a bigot. She stated that the present administration was the 'smartest and most intelligent to ever reside in the White House.'"

"I asked her if she was out of her mind. 'What about Roosevelt and Kennedy?' she asked. I responded by asking her what was she talking about. She responded by saying, 'They exploited women, and it was Obama that divided and polarized the Nation.'"

"I knew at that point that she was steeped in her ignorant opinion. I responded by telling her that I was not alive during the Roosevelt years and during the administration of John F. Kennedy we did not have internet and the means of communication that we have today. Regardless, at least they both were sophisticated statesmen who publicly presented themselves as leaders. Secondly, the rightwing went after Clinton for his indiscretions and Obama was scandal free."

"It is glaringly apparent that many who support the present administration are either racist, steeped in religious beliefs, ignorant, or, as my mother used to say, 'just plain dumb.' They have chosen to support a president who has a proven record of being sexually condescending to women, will not oppose the resurgence of the Ku Klux Klan and other hate organizations, is indecisive, condescending to anyone who challenges him, and hides behind

his Twitter account, rather than dealing with the real issues in our country and around the world, and, to put icing on this cake, he is a proven liar."

"I believe the crooked ascension of Trump to the Oval Office is a gauge that measures the declining patriotic and moral values of many of the citizens of America, as well as being the revelation of the hidden bigotry, judgmental attitudes that yet exist in many of those who call themselves evangelicals."

"This President has surrounded himself with yes-men and -women who apparently refuse to challenge his madness for fear of his wrath. I believe I can safely assume that the United States is no longer a democracy. A democratic government is one that is governed by the people or their elected representatives. In 2 years, this man has turned the tide and the Nation is spiraling downhill quickly."

"My growing concern is that the Congress and Senate of these United States have more of a personal interest for themselves rather than a patriotic duty to the people they represent. The Republicans appear to have become a Trump cult, and the Democrats refuse to move against this man in a collective, decisive way."

"I remember the time that we were guided by principle and not by party. Congress, Senators, you were not elected to collect a paycheck, you were elected to be women and men of principle and maintain the health of a Democratic nation."

"It does not take a genius to discern that this man wants to be a dictator in the truest sense of the word. He appears to be drawn to the evil of tyrannical dictators and is alienating our country from our closest and most trusted allies. This President praises the leaders of Russia and North Korea, while at the same time has been condescending to the leaders of Canada, the United Kingdom, and Germany, just to name a few. Something is wrong with this."

"Despite all of this, there are still many, including evangelicals and people of color, who are resolute in their support of this administration."

"Thomas Paine wrote:"

Men must conquer their own spirits. Even in the shadows of the guillotine, we must preserve and endure in spite of the threat."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind Members that remarks in debate may not engage in personalities toward the President, including by repeating remarks made elsewhere that would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

□ 1030

IN HONOR OF SERGEANT CARL MANN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUCSHON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUCSHON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the incredible life and heroic service of Sergeant Carl Mann.

This past week, on the 75th anniversary of D-day, I visited Normandy, France, where Sergeant Mann and more than 150,000 American troops stormed the beaches to gain a foothold in mainland Europe.

For his heroic service, Sergeant Mann, a native of Mount Vernon, Indiana, received three Purple Hearts and seven Bronze Stars while serving in the 5th Infantry Division of General George S. Patton's 3rd Army.

In fitting fashion of a true hero, Sergeant Mann was laid to rest in Arlington National Cemetery on June 6, this year, the 75th anniversary of D-day. Today, I take a moment to honor the selflessness that he and the Greatest Generation made so that we and future generations of Americans may enjoy boundless freedoms.

My prayers are with his children and grandchildren that carry on his legacy. His memory will forever be a reminder of a day of great tragedy, but also of triumph.

Rest in peace and God bless.

TITLE X FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CASE). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Speaker, I am here to speak on the importance of Title X Family Planning programs and to condemn the Trump administration's misguided efforts to prevent patients from making fully informed health decisions.

This week, the House will begin to reverse years of deep funding cuts to this vital program, a slash-and-burn approach that has had drastic impacts on the health of women and families.

Consider this: 7 years of Republican cuts left 1.2 million without access to proper care.

This is shameful.

I am proud to have led, with the support of more than 190 of my colleagues, the effort to urge the Appropriations Committee to include \$400 million for the Title X Family Planning program in fiscal year 2020.

Nearly 4 million people struggling to make ends meet, including people of color, LGBTQ people, immigrants, and people in underserved rural communities, receive care at Title X centers.

We must support the health of millions of Americans by supporting Title X and preventing States from discriminating against potential Title X providers.

THE NEWTOWN QUAKER MEETING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize an outstanding group of young citizens from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who are ac-

tively living out their faith and making our community a better place.

Earlier this year, members of the Newtown Quaker Meeting helped raise \$1,665 for the Mercer Street Friends' Community Schools through a lasagna dinner held at the Newtown Friends Meetinghouse. The youth collected voluntary donations, served the meal, and cleaned up after dinner.

This exemplary act of community service is the norm, not the exception, for young members of Newtown Quaker Meeting.

Previously held lasagna dinners have raised funds for PennDel Food Pantry, Heifer International, Haiti Relief, and Save Darfur, among other organizations. By serving simple meals twice a year, they have now raised over \$28,000 for charity over a 10-year period.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the work of these children, their parents, and congregants of the Newtown Quaker Meeting. I would like to particularly thank members of the Children's Religious Education Committee of Newtown Meeting, including Sarah Buxton, Eileen Grant, and Kelly Lake for all of their work.

IN MEMORY OF MALCOLM CROOKS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and memory of a resident of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who passed away last month at the age of 96.

Malcolm Crooks, a lifelong resident of Solebury Township, was a noted environmental and conservation leader. He was the founding member of the Honey Hollow and Aquetong Watershed Associations and was a member of the first Solebury Township Planning Commission. He also served on numerous boards that promoted environmental protection, including those of the Bucks County Audubon Society and the Bucks County Planning Commission.

A man of devout faith, Malcolm was a member of Solebury Friends Meeting, and in the 1960s, he moved to Algeria and led a team of Quakers to assist local residents. Throughout his life, Malcolm and his wife, Elaine, continued to travel the globe and immerse themselves in world cultures.

Mr. Speaker, Malcolm made our community a better place. Generations will continue to experience the beauty of our home because of his selfless work.

I send my prayers and condolences to Malcolm's wife and his children—Sylvia, Malcolm, and Catherine—along with his entire family.

IN MEMORY OF PETE ROSSETTI

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor the life and memory of an American patriot from Bucks County, Pennsylvania, who passed away on June 5 at the age of 96. Pete Rossetti, a resident of Southampton, lived a life in service to our country and our community.

Born in Philadelphia, Pete served honorably in the United States Navy during World War II. He earned the

American Theater, European Theater Combat Medal and was also a Purple Heart recipient. In January, Pete was awarded the French Legion of Honor Medal, the highest French military distinction, for his service. Pete served in several campaigns during the war, including the invasion of Sicily, Salerno, Angelo, and Normandy.

A graduate of Temple University, Pete earned a degree in business administration from Temple University, and he later worked as an employee benefit consultant.

Mr. Speaker, I send my deepest condolences to Pete's children—Donna, Sandra, Carla, Joseph, and Mary Ellen—along with the entire Rossetti family. May they take comfort that he is now reunited with Annette and enjoying his eternal reward.

OUR ECONOMY IS SICK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, this administration continues to tell us that our economic recovery is chugging along, that it has even been hypercharged under President Trump.

They say there is well over 7.5 million unfilled jobs and 6 million people looking for work, that wages are beginning to pick up. The stock market has reached record highs and the unemployment rate, record lows.

So why aren't our constituents celebrating, saving, and spending at equally historic rates?

Mr. Speaker, everyone in this Chamber knows what I am talking about. They can feel it. Why does it all seem so fragile, like this country is walking on economic eggshells?

Because that is how it feels to American families every single day. Because in today's America, you can work a 12-hour shift, 7 days a week, year after year—get in one car accident on your way home from work and end up bankrupt.

Because the cost of a college education is leaving a generation of graduates with a high-interest mortgage without the house.

Because the cost of childcare is becoming even more unaffordable than that college degree.

Because the cost of a two-bedroom apartment swallows up the income of a full-time minimum wage worker in every single neighborhood in our country.

Because nearly 40 percent of Americans can't afford an unexpected \$400 medical bill, and skyrocketing pharmaceutical costs are forcing families to open GoFundMe pages to keep their kids alive.

Just over a decade after hitting rock bottom, our economy is still sick for a very simple reason: We haven't correctly diagnosed the cause of that illness.

We are comforted by the improvement of external symptoms, like stock

prices and unemployment rates; meanwhile, our economy's heart is in dire straits. Small businesses are shuttered, factories are fleeing, family farms are closing, and once-prosperous American towns are barely scraping by.

To blame for this chronic illness is a system that has whittled away protection, opportunity, justice, and dignity for the American worker.

Our workers rise like their parents before them—early. They work hard to provide for their family for well into the night; they skip lunch breaks; they defer vacation; they trade with coworkers to take an overtime shift—all to care for the ones they love. And yet the jobs that they hold won't even allow for that.

The whole point of a job is to earn a living and make a life, to contribute to something purposeful, to be able to provide for your loved ones in return.

If American jobs can't meet the needs of Americans, then what is the point? How will the greatest economy in the world possibly endure if its people can't keep up.

Mr. Speaker, I read a story a few weeks ago about a few local Home Depot employees who built a walker for a little boy whose parents were not certain that insurance would cover a proper one. And just yesterday, news sites blasted a story of a 9-year-old little boy in California who used his own allowance to pay off the lunch debts of his classmates.

The goodness of those workers, of those children is incredible, and thank God we have people like them among us. But a moral, a just, a fair, an accountable, and a decent economy wouldn't call those stories heartwarming but heartbreaking, a damning indictment of a system that bars countless Americans of basic necessity, particularly in their moments of deep need.

A moral capitalism would put quality on the same page as quantity. It wouldn't just ask for integrity and decency from the public and private sectors running our economic show, it would demand it, with laws that work in tandem to guarantee that when our kids get sick, we can take care of them; when our roof falls, we can repair it; when our stomachs ache, we can fill them; and when we tire, we can rest.

Mr. Speaker, that shouldn't be too much for anyone to ask.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of the mothers, fathers, brothers, and daughters, the classmates and coworkers, the surviving family and community members, all of whom have been robbed of loved ones due to senseless acts of gun violence.

I rise on behalf of mothers with broken spirits and broken hearts.

I rise on behalf of fathers with deep wounds and invisible scars, a lifetime of guilt because they couldn't keep their child out of harm's way.

□ 1045

Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of young boys and girls, children traumatized and sad because they have attended more funerals than graduation parties.

I rise on behalf of survivors, community organizations, and advocates who selflessly trigger their own trauma to stand on the front lines of justice and movement building.

I rise on behalf of districts like mine, the Massachusetts Seventh, that are weighed down by systemic inequities, generational poverty, and cycles of violence.

Today, in partnership with organizers, advocates, and survivors, I am calling for a National Survivors of Homicide Victims Awareness Month to amplify the voices of families and communities severely and disproportionately impacted by gun violence; to center their struggles, their stories, their truths; to foster peace; and to seek justice.

Already this year, 16 families across the Massachusetts Seventh have been robbed of their loved ones. I rise in remembrance of them and in recognition of those they left behind:

Emmanuel Molin, 32, survived by his two sons, mother, father, and five siblings;

Godfrey Jenkins Hall, 28, survived by his son, brother, and aunt;

Carl Reynolds, 28, survived by his mother, father, siblings, and daughter;

Gary Brown, 34, survived by his son and sister;

Judy Romero, 29, survived by five children, fiancé, father, and siblings;

Juan Morales, 32, survived by his three children;

Kasim Kahrin, 36, survived by his sisters, aunts, and uncles;

Kendric Price, 32, survived by his mother, grandmother, brothers, and grandchildren;

Haki Sanders, 33, survived by his mother;

Eleanor Maloney, 74, survived by three daughters, a son, six grandchildren, seven great-grandchildren, and four siblings;

Michael Dukes, 53, survived by his mother, father, five children, one grandson, sister, and dear friends;

Kevin Boyd, 53, survived by his wife, two sons, grandchildren, and brother;

Kevin Brewington, 33, survived by his mother, father, son, brothers, and sisters;

Donell Davis, 24, survived by his mother, brothers, and sister;

Carl Brown, 43, survived by his child; and

Luckinson Oruma, 60, survived by his wife and five children.

Tomorrow will mark the anniversary of 49 souls lost, lives we were robbed of 3 years ago at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, and the fear and trauma of those who survived and the families and loved ones that they left behind.

May we remember them. May we speak up for them. May we fight to ensure that there is no one else like them.

Long gone are the days of thoughts and prayers. Now is the time for outrage, equitable outrage, policy, and change. This is a public health crisis, an epidemic.

Bullets do not discriminate. They don't care if we are a Member of Congress, a World Series champion, a senior citizen, or a child.

It is up to Congress to demonstrate courage, to do what is right for our children, for our communities, for all survivors impacted by gun violence.

Enough is enough. These survivors deserve our respect. They deserve our resources. They deserve healing. They deserve justice.

In districts like the Massachusetts Seventh, community-based organizations are doing their job every day: Violence in Boston, Operation LIPSTICK, We Are Better Together, the Louis D. Brown Peace Institute, the Justice Resource Institute, the Women Survivors of Homicide Movement, and the Bobby Mendes Peace Legacy project.

Our Suffolk County D.A., Rachael Rollins, is fighting every day to improve our clearance rates to get these surviving family members the justice they deserve.

It is time for Congress to do our job. Enough is enough.

COMMEMORATING 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF MIGHTY MO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KENNEDY). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. CASE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the 75th birthday of one of the most iconic ships ever to sail the seven seas, the U.S. Navy's USS *Missouri*.

Mighty Mo, our last battleship, was commissioned June 11, 1944, after being laid down and launched at the Brooklyn Navy Yard. She went on to one of the longest and most distinguished careers of any Navy ship ever, earning 11 battle stars in three wars: World War II, the Korean war, and Operation Desert Shield/Desert Storm.

But she is best known for her role not in war but in peace. For of course it was on her decks at anchor in Tokyo Bay on September 2, 1945, V-J Day, that General Douglas MacArthur accepted the surrender of Japan, ending World War II.

Mighty Mo was finally struck from the register in 1995. For the last two decades, she has been moored in a place of honor at Pearl Harbor, alongside her fallen sisters—most notably, the USS *Arizona*—as a living museum under the loving stewardship of the USS *Missouri* Memorial Association in partnership with the U.S. Navy.

On her decks next year, on September 2, we will recognize the 75th anniversary of the end of the Second World War. But for today, let us simply

wish Mighty Mo a heartfelt hau'oli la hanau, happy birthday, and many more to come. Mahalo.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 50 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Jacob Isaac Pack, Beckley United Pentecostal Church, Beckley, West Virginia, offered the following prayer:

Lord God, today we want to say thank You. Thank You, Lord, for allowing us to be a part of something bigger than ourselves. Thank You, God, for trusting us with this awesome responsibility of continuing the proud traditions of this great Nation. We thank You, Lord, for the heritage of sacrifice that has been passed down by those who have come before us.

Father, as we endeavor to continue in that noble heritage, we ask You for Your wisdom and Your guidance. We ask You to grant unity to Your people and oneness of purpose. We ask that Your presence reside among all of the men and women here today who rise to the tasks of both leadership and service. We reverently ask that the results of our work bring peace, prosperity, and safety to all who are entrusted in our care.

In the name of Jesus, we pray.
Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. WILSON) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND JACOB ISAAC PACK

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to welcome Reverend Jacob Isaac Pack from Putnam County in my district as the guest chaplain today. Reverend Pack is an ordained minister with the United Pentecostal Church International and currently serves as the pastor of Beckley United Pentecostal Church.

Over the 20 years that he has been involved in ministry, Reverend Pack has served local congregations as well as in State and national offices of the United Pentecostal Church. Reverend Pack serves as the West Virginia-Western Maryland District Sunday school director and on the National Sunday School Committee.

Reverend Pack is actively involved in the public service sector with his position as the executive director of the Kanawha Public Service District, also in my congressional district. He serves in his local community as the vice president of the Putnam County Planning Commission.

Reverend Pack and his fabulous wife, Tiffany, have three wonderful children, Hayden, Jamison, and Juliette.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BROWN of Maryland). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

HONORING HENRY PARHAM

(Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to one of my constituents, Mr. Henry Parham, who is believed to be the last surviving African American combat veteran from D-day. Mr. Parham served in the 320th Barrage Balloon Battalion, the only African American combat unit to land in Normandy on June 6, 1944.

Men from the 320th were in the first waves to land on Omaha Beach that day. They had the vital task of preventing enemy aircraft from attacking the beaches where men in equipment were pouring ashore. Their balloons prevented enemy planes from making effective attacks, but the balloons also made excellent targets for enemy fire.

Back then, the Army, like most of American society, was segregated. Nevertheless, these African Americans risked their lives to serve their country, even as Blacks faced Jim Crow laws and racist violence back home.

Needless to say, the German bombs and bullets didn't discriminate. Two thousand Americans died on Omaha Beach that day, including men from the 320th. Many more were wounded.

I want to recognize Henry Parham from the 320th Barrage Balloon Battalion for his heroic service to our country. I am very proud to represent Mr. Parham in Congress.

102 YEARS OF HONOR AT FORT JACKSON

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, last week was the 102nd anniversary and Victory Week at Fort Jackson in South Carolina.

Under the leadership of Brigadier General Milford Beagle, Jr., and Command Sergeant Major Jeremiah Gan, Fort Jackson is the bedrock for building readiness for all components of the Army.

This week, the Greater Columbia Region is being honored as a Great American Defense Communities Award recipient. The Columbia Chamber of Commerce, led by President Carl Blackstone and Chairman David Lockwood, provided the nomination, citing Fort Jackson, the South Carolina National Guard, and McEntire Joint Air Base.

Fort Jackson is the Nation's largest basic training base, conducting over half of the Army's basic combat training, with over 60,000 soldiers per year and with about 10,000 soldiers in basic combat training at any given time. Fort Jackson also trains more than 60 percent of all women entering the Army each year.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

CLIMATE HEALTH PROGRAM

(Mr. SCHNEIDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, in Illinois, the spring rains have meant that less than one-half of the normal amount of corn had been planted this year. We are seeing catastrophic floods, record-setting tornadoes, and longer and more devastating fire seasons.

Climate change is not a future threat; it is a threat now, and we need to take urgent action. The decisions we make today will determine the future we leave to our children.

We also need to prepare for the consequences of climate change, which are already affecting our environment, our infrastructure, our economy, and, yes, even our health.

More frequent and intense heat waves are leading to higher rates of heat stroke. Warmer temperatures are also directly affecting vector-, food-, and waterborne diseases and causing longer allergy seasons.

We need to understand and prepare for these changes. That is why I led a letter to the House Appropriations Committee urging support for the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Climate and Health Program to help our city and State health departments address and prepare for the effects of climate change.

I am pleased that funding for their important work has increased to \$15 million in this year's bill. I urge my colleagues to support this provision to help vulnerable communities adapt to the health threats of climate change.

CONDITIONS OF MIGRANT DETENTION FACILITIES ARE INHUMANE

(Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I am joined today by my colleagues to show our country the inhumane conditions of migrant detention facilities.

As a grandfather and an immigrant, my heart breaks every time another child dies in U.S. custody.

Migrants are escaping some of the harshest political and economic turmoil in Central America, only to have their children die once they arrive here. Like 1-year-old Mariee Juarez and her mother who fled domestic abuse in Guatemala, then she died in a U.S. hospital after receiving inadequate care.

We don't allow prisoners to die. How are we allowing children to die in Federal custody?

Last week, the inspector general of DHS confirmed what we already knew: Conditions are dangerous and unsanitary.

This is cruel and un-American. This cannot be the new normal. What the President is doing is anything but normal.

When Attorney General Sessions initiated this, it was a bad way to move forward.

Is this the message that President Trump wants to send the world, that the U.S. is where children come to die?

How many children must die before this administration acts?

CELEBRATING NATIONAL HOMEOWNERSHIP MONTH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to ad-

dress the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, June is National Homeownership Month, and it is the time when we celebrate and recognize the many benefits of owning a home.

For generations of Americans, owning a home has been an essential element in achieving the American Dream. But since the Great Recession, we have seen homeownership rates dip to historic lows.

Young families often find themselves unable to save for a down payment or gain access to adequate credit, and that is especially true for those living in rural areas.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture places emphasis on helping rural Americans buy homes. USDA provides mortgage loan guarantees through partnerships with private-sector lenders to help low- to moderate-income rural home buyers. USDA has helped more than 4.4 million rural residents buy homes since the National Housing Act was passed 70 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, homeownership has widespread benefits: It fortifies communities, creates jobs, and strengthens the local businesses that support our towns.

I thank USDA for its commitment to providing affordable housing for rural Americans. By helping hardworking Americans achieve this dream, it provides a strong foundation for more prosperous rural communities.

AMERICA IS BETTER THAN THIS

(Mr. ESPAILLAT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I have seen with my very own eyes the way migrants at the southern border, particularly children, are treated under U.S. custody. It is so appalling, we would not ever accept one of our own children being treated in such conditions in any country across the world. Young toddlers go days without proper hygiene, nutrition, or medical treatment.

These awful conditions have led to the deaths of minors at the hands of our government, like Felipe Gomez Alonzo, who was just 8 years old.

If this administration's plan is to mistreat refugees to prevent them from coming here, it clearly is not working. Just think, if they would rather risk this treatment than remain in their home countries, how bad must it be there?

America is better than this. We must treat immigrants better than this. We must treat refugees better than this. We must treat children better than this.

Mr. Speaker, the whole world is watching.

ADDRESSING HUMANITARIAN CHALLENGES FACED AT SOUTHERN BORDER

(Ms. ESCOBAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ESCOBAR. Mr. Speaker, on May 31, the Department of Homeland Security's Office of Inspector General published an alarming report that confirms the terrible consequences of the Trump administration's failure to truly address the humanitarian challenges we face at our southern border.

Instead of working with Congress and leaders in our hemisphere on addressing root causes and policy that represents America's values of compassion, the administration, instead, chooses cruelty.

As a result, agents and officers are overworked, exhausted, and frustrated. Communities like mine are stretched beyond capacity, and migrants are in inhumane conditions.

The photos and description of the conditions at the Paso Del Norte Processing Center in my district are beyond disturbing:

Migrants standing on toilets to make room and gain breathing space;

A cell with a maximum capacity of 35 holding 155 migrants;

Detainees wearing soiled clothing for days or weeks;

The list goes on.

I visited the PDN Processing Center when I was home this weekend, and one thing is clear: Congress must establish, and DHS must abide by, humanitarian standards. Not doing so is immoral and un-American.

□ 1215

ICE SOLITARY CONFINEMENT

(Ms. GARCIA of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GARCIA of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the inhumane treatment of immigrants at detention centers around the country.

Recently exposed documents paint a gruesome picture of ICE custodians abusing the practice of solitary confinement on immigration detainees. Often these detainees have not violated rules or shown dangerous behavior, but, in some instances, are being held in isolation because they are disabled or because they identify as gay.

Even under ICE's own guidelines, solitary confinement is a serious step that requires careful consideration of all alternatives. Yet, ICE is using this practice as a tool of first resort, not last resort. One detainee noted that the strain of the isolation made him lose his mind.

These reported cases reveal what we already feared: that this administration is committed to widespread abuse of human beings simply because of who they are and where they come from.

Mr. Speaker, I learned at an early age that we are all God's children. This is not the way to treat God's children.

GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. MALINOWSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MALINOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, June is Gun Violence Awareness Month, and I am so tired of watching innocent children being lowered into the ground.

A week ago, there was another mass shooting in Virginia Beach. The shooter had a sound suppressor and a large capacity magazine. And it struck me: these things which gave him an advantage are banned in my home State of New Jersey. We have one of the lowest rates of gun violence of any State in America.

Why is that? We have poverty, we have crime, we have mental illness just like other States, but we also have sensible gun laws.

It has been just over 100 days since the House passed a sensible gun bill that the vast majority of Americans support. Universal background checks will save lives. The Senate could pass this bill today, but the Senate majority leader refuses to hold a vote.

Mr. Speaker, this is what the voters who sent us here are most tired of: special interests blocking action on what most of us agree must be done.

It is time for the Senate to give the American people the safety and common sense that they voted for and, at long last, pass universal background checks.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG COSTS

(Mr. CARSON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CARSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that Americans pay too much for their prescription drugs, and something must be done.

That is why I am pleased House Democrats are addressing the rising costs of these medications. We have passed legislation like H.R. 987 and H.R. 1503, both of which can lower the cost of prescription drugs by helping to bring a greater number of generic drugs to market, but we can't stop there.

We must act boldly and in a bipartisan manner, Mr. Speaker, to confront the obstacles that stand between hard-working Americans and affordable prescriptions necessary for their well-being. In the wealthiest nation in the world, Mr. Speaker, no one should have to face these barriers to affordable, quality healthcare.

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY DETENTION FACILITIES

(Mr. CÁRDENAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CÁRDENAS. Mr. Speaker, Jakelin Caal Maquin, 7-year-old girl.

Felipe Gomez Alonzo, 8 years old. Juan de Leon Gutierrez, 16 years old. Carlos Hernandez Vasquez, 16 years old. All of these children died under our custody in the United States of America.

In the last 8 months, six children have died in the United States of America under the custody of the Department of Homeland Security. It pains me to say this because I am not talking about some war-torn country halfway around the world. This is happening right here in the United States of America.

Over the past 2 years, under this President, President Donald Trump, 24 men, women, and children who came looking for a better life in the United States of America died.

This administration's treatment is inhumane. What President Trump and this administration are doing is shameful.

Mr. Speaker, let's be very clear: the crisis at the border is a humanitarian crisis that is the product of the President's deadly policies. We need accountability and this President will need to answer for his role in the loss of life, on our soil, at the United States border.

GUN VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, this is Gun Violence Awareness Month. I rise to commemorate the life of Ms. Briuna Harps, a young woman with a bright future in Fort Worth, who lost her life in a senseless act of gun violence last month.

Nineteen-year-old Briuna had just finished her first year of pre-med classes when she was visiting her sister at an apartment complex in Fort Worth and was struck by a bullet in the cross-fire between two gangs, two idiotic gangs, in an idiotic gang war. Sadly, Briuna's death and deaths like it are too commonplace in America. Each day, nearly 100 people in our Nation are killed by someone using a gun.

Recently, the city of Fort Worth launched a local initiative to protect our neighborhoods and curb gun violence. The Senate can help us in this area by taking action to pass common-sense gun safety legislation that the House passed over 100 days ago. Taking action is the best way that we can honor the life of Briuna and the other lives just like hers who were lost to gun violence.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the community and give special thanks to Pastor Milton Pace, Tiffany Pace Whitaker, and Montreal Dukes for hosting a recent dialogue on curbing violence in our Fort Worth community.

But we need the Senate to do their part. We need them to act. Pass the legislation that we passed in the House now.

FUTURE OF AMERICA'S FARMERS

(Mrs. CRAIG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CRAIG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of family farmers throughout the Midwest and in my home State of Minnesota. We are facing a year of unseasonably wet conditions, leaving many producers weighing their options for the future of their farms.

I am proud to join my colleague, Representative DUSTY JOHNSON of South Dakota, in introducing the FEED Act, a bipartisan bill to give farmers flexibility to graze and harvest cover crops on prevent plant acres.

Congress has a responsibility to do right by our Nation's farmers who feed, clothe, and fuel our communities by providing them the flexibility they need to do their jobs successfully. This bill will help alleviate concerns of a forage shortage and improve soil health through the use of cover crops.

This is a bipartisan, commonsense solution, and we need a whole lot more of that in this House. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to come together and support this bill and stand up for our farmers throughout the country.

HONORING THERESA BURROUGHS

(Ms. SEWELL of Alabama asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the extraordinary life and legacy of Theresa Burroughs, a champion for voting rights and a foot soldier of the civil rights movement.

Sadly, Mrs. Burroughs passed away on May 22, 2019, at the age of 89.

Mrs. Burroughs dedicated her life to advancing equality and justice and making sure that future generations would learn about the sacrifices and the bravery of foot soldiers who marched, bled, and died for the right to vote and for civil rights in this country.

She is best known for her stewardship in founding the Safe House Black History Museum in Greensboro, Alabama. The museum is located in the same house in Hale County where Dr. Martin Luther King hid out from the KKK on a visit to west Alabama in 1968. The museum houses materials to educate future generations of the local struggle that happened in the Black Belt of Alabama on behalf of all of us.

I am deeply honored to have known Mrs. Burroughs, and, in fact, I had the opportunity to present Mrs. Burroughs with a Congressional Gold Medal for her participation in the 1965 march from Selma to Montgomery. I am deeply honored because I know I stand on the shoulders of Mrs. Burroughs. So many of us do. Her bright light will always glow through the many lives that

she impacted. May my colleagues join me in celebrating the exemplary life of Mrs. Burroughs today and honor her great contributions to this Nation, the State of Alabama, and to the civil rights and voting rights movements.

REMEMBERING JAKELIN CAAL MAQUIN

(Mr. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUIZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in memory of Jakelin Caal Maquin, a 7-year-old Guatemalan girl, who died in December while in the custody of our Federal Government.

Seven months ago, Jakelin joined her father in fleeing the extreme danger and poverty of her village in Guatemala. They fled from violence. However, Jakelin's life was cut short in December when she died of sepsis while under the responsibility of our Federal Government.

As a physician, I know that the inhumane conditions at our Border Patrol facilities risk the lives of children when under CBP custody. That is why, this week, I am introducing the Humanitarian Standards for Individuals in CBP Act, legislation requiring CBP to meet the humanitarian needs of children and families in their custody.

My bill will require health screenings and improved access to lifesaving equipment and medications, and it will set minimum standards to ensure access to food, water, and shelter.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense bill to help prevent future deaths of children at the border and restore humanity to our treatment of asylum seekers and families.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2740, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. RES. 430, AUTHORIZING COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO INITIATE OR INTERVENE IN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS TO ENFORCE CERTAIN SUBPOENAS

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 431 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 431

Resolved, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes.

The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-17, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted in the House and in the Committee of the Whole. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as the original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the five-minute rule and shall be considered as read. Points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of this resolution.

(b) Each further amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or her designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 15 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment pursuant to this resolution, the Committee of the Whole shall rise without motion. No further consideration of the bill shall be in order except pursuant to a subsequent order of the House.

SEC. 6. (a) During consideration of H.R. 2740, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment proposing both a decrease in an appropriation designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 and an increase in an appropriation not so designated, or vice versa.

(b) This section shall not apply to an amendment between the Houses.

SEC. 7. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the resolution (H. Res. 430) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas and for other purposes. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Rules now printed in the resolution shall be considered as adopted. The resolution, as amended, shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution, as amended, to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1230

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, H.R. 431, providing for consideration of H.R. 2740, making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, and H. Res. 430, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas and, also, for other purposes.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 2740 under a structured rule, self-executes Chairwoman LOWEY's manager's amendment, and makes in order 106 different amendments.

The rule provides 1 hour of general debate, equally and divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, and provides that they may offer up to 15 pro forma amendments, each for the purposes of debate.

The chair of the Appropriations Committee may also offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments made in order by the rule and not earlier disposed of.

Additionally, the rule provides for consideration of H. Res. 430 under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally and divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, this rule pairs two bills which demonstrate the commitment of the House majority both to making strong progress for the American people in the areas of health, labor, and education, at the same time that we defend the Constitution of the United States and the rule of law against the obstructionism and the lawlessness of the executive branch of government.

Let's start with H.R. 2740, which is designed to make government work for our people. It provides \$189.9 billion in discretionary funding for the Department of Labor, the Department of Education, and the Department of Health and Human Services.

It increases investment in the National Institutes of Health, our country's preeminent medical research agency, a national treasure, which is headquartered in Bethesda, Maryland, in my district, to support research for Alzheimer's disease, HIV/Aids, breast cancer, colon cancer, cystic fibrosis, multiple sclerosis, childhood cancer, heart disease, stroke, diabetes, mental health, suicide prevention, and the Cancer Moonshot initiative.

The people of NIH and their network of allied entities and agencies and supported universities and research labs across the country are making profound progress in the struggle to uplift the health of the people against all of the killer diseases of our time.

And for the first time in more than 20 years, this bill contains funding to support gun violence and firearm injury prevention research, and we are proud of that.

This legislation increases funding for Department of Education programs to help America's children succeed, providing critical resources for elementary and secondary schools, special ed programs, and Federal student aid. Importantly, the bill increases the maximum Pell grant to help America's college and graduate students keep pace with inflation and the high cost of living.

H.R. 2740 also provides \$56.4 billion in funding for the State Department, USAID, and the U.S. Institute of Peace. We are making major strategic investments in diplomacy, global health, and international basic education, the crucial ingredients for maintaining peace and security around the world.

This legislation provides essential humanitarian assistance and critical funding to improve maternal and child health, to fight diseases like malaria, and to support women's reproductive health and literacy across the globe. We know that the key to improving social and economic development around the world is the education of women and the investment in family planning programs and literacy about procreation.

This legislation renews our Nation's commitment to addressing the climate crisis by investing in directives on adaption and renewable energy. It also prohibits the use of any government

funds to withdraw from the Paris climate agreement.

Now, on the other legislation, which deals with contempt, Mr. Speaker, we know from Special Counsel Mueller's report that there was a sweeping and systematic assault on America's elections in 2016. There was a conscious effort and plan by Vladimir Putin and the GRU to undermine and destabilize the American elections by interfering and hacking into the Democratic National Committee, the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee, Hillary Clinton's offices to inject poisonous ideological propaganda into the body politic of America through Facebook, through Twitter, through YouTube and other social media entities and then to directly hack into the State boards of election.

The Department of Justice launched a special counsel inquiry. It was a Republican Attorney General who named a Republican special counsel, Mr. Mueller, to do it.

The President of the United States, according to Special Counsel Mueller's report, engaged in at least 10 different episodes of efforts to interfere with that investigation, to obstruct justice. We received that report a couple of months ago from the special counsel.

In the aftermath of it, President Trump said, "We are fighting all subpoenas," and declared that there would be no cooperation from the executive branch with legislative branch subpoenas, with our demands for documents, with our demands for witnesses, with our demands for testimony from the executive branch. He said: "I don't want people testifying," and, "There is no reason to go any further." And since then, they have drawn a curtain down over the executive branch of government and defied the lawful orders of the Congress of the United States.

The Trump administration is stonewalling, from pillar to post, congressional investigations, defying validly issued congressional subpoenas. So, for example, Attorney General Barr is refusing to produce the full unredacted Mueller report and the related underlying evidence to the House Committee on the Judiciary.

Every other independent special counsel had simply turned their report over to Congress and Congress did the redactions, but Attorney General Barr engaged in a series of games with the Congress of the United States and confused the American public, as Special Counsel Mueller complained in a letter that he sent to the Attorney General.

He is also defying a House Intelligence Committee subpoena directing him to turn over documents and materials related to Special Counsel Mueller's investigation, including all counterintelligence and foreign intelligence materials produced during the investigation.

Don McGahn, the former White House counsel, has defied a subpoena issued by the House Committee on the Judiciary without any substantial legal basis at all.

Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin is defying a subpoena from the House Ways and Means Committee directing him to produce the President's tax returns under a statute that makes it crystal clear that Congress has a right to obtain the tax returns of the President or any other citizen of the United States.

Commerce Secretary Ross and Attorney General William Barr are refusing to comply with duly authorized bipartisan subpoenas from the House Oversight and Reform Committee, which is investigating the administration's shadowy and illicit efforts to add an illegitimate citizenship question to the 2020 Census completely outside of the Administrative Procedures Act process. Several District Courts have struck that down. But, in any event, the administration is refusing to turn over evidence, relevant evidence, to Congress about this effort to impose the citizenship question on the census.

The administration is refusing to turn over documents, witnesses, and testimony relating to the corruption of the security clearance process in the White House personnel office.

There were 25 different individuals who were denied a security clearance by the professional staff in the White House personnel office, who were then overruled by President Trump or political appointees. We are trying to get information as to what was the basis for the original denial. It was, likely, conflict with foreign governments or financial conflicts of interest. It might also have been drug or alcohol problems. But we want to get the details of each one, and then we want to know if there is any written documentation of why the President and his subordinates overturned those.

In all of these cases, Mr. Speaker, the executive branch of government has followed President Trump's orders to say, simply: We are not going to turn anything over to Congress.

Now, understand, the Supreme Court of the United States has held that it is an essential and integral aspect of legislative power to engage in investigation and factfinding. That is how the people's Representatives are able to legislate: We are able to get information. But if you shut down our ability to get information, we cannot engage in lawmaking. For that reason, we have begun to win in all of these Federal District Court cases where we are going out to try to get this information.

But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot tie up the floor of the House of Representatives every time the executive branch decides to follow the order of the President and simply deny us the information that we seek.

My friends across the aisle know from the Fast and Furious investigation, the Hillary Clinton email investigation, the Benghazi investigation it is Congress' right to investigate and to obtain the documents that it wants. They obtained millions of documents

in those investigations. We had a right to get them then, and we have a right to get all of these documents now.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will give the power, first of all, to the Committee on the Judiciary to follow through on the subpoenas that it has issued. It will also empower and authorize each chair of the House of Representatives to enforce their lawful subpoenas that are being dishonored and violated by the executive branch of government.

So we are very proud to bring forward these two pieces of legislation, one which makes good on our commitment to the American people to continue to make progress in the fields of education, healthcare, labor, and scientific and medical research while, at the same time, we defend the Constitution, the rule of law, the prerogatives and powers of Congress against the lawlessness and the obstructionism of this administration.

We are the preeminent and primary branch of government. The very first sentence of the Constitution, Mr. Speaker: "We the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

The second sentence that follows is all legislative power is vested in the Congress of the United States.

□ 1245

The sovereign power of the people comes right through the preamble into Article I, establishing us as the representatives of the people. Then you get dozens of paragraphs setting forth all the powers of Congress: to declare war, to raise revenues, to write budgets, to impeach the President or other executive branch officials who commit high crimes and misdemeanors and to remove them in the Senate, to set up a post office, to govern the seat of government, and to establish a capital city. Those are the prerogatives and powers of Congress.

Then you get to Article II, and Article II fixes the powers of the President. What are the President's core responsibilities? To take care that the laws are faithfully executed. That is the President's job: to take care that the laws are faithfully executed.

It is even in Article II that the President can be impeached, in Section 4.

Just to make it clear, the President works for the Congress; the Congress doesn't work for the President. And we, the Congress, work for the people.

That is what it means to have a representative democracy. We work for the people.

Now, we have a President who is in an unprecedented, wholesale, categorical defiance of the powers of Congress by denying us the information that we seek to obtain, which is our right and which is our need.

We are going to get it, and we are going to get it by empowering Congress to go to court to enforce our subpoenas.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN), for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I hadn't had this in the opening, but I want to disagree with my friend right off the top. The President of the United States does not work for the Congress of the United States. He works for the American people, and he heads up a branch of government that is a coequal branch of government. So, on that, we will have a long discussion.

Mr. Speaker, it has been a very eventful week in the Rules Committee, and it is only Tuesday. Last night, the committee met and reported out a rule that covers two drastically different measures. H.R. 2740 is an appropriations package that covered first 5 and then 4 of the 12 appropriations bills for fiscal year 2020. We also considered H. Res. 430, a resolution that gives authority to the Office of the General Counsel of the House of Representatives to seek to enforce certain subpoenas for documents through litigation.

Shortly after we finish here, the committee will again convene to consider the remainder of the appropriations package, which will be on the floor as part of a separate rule tomorrow.

Meanwhile, our Members will attempt the miracle of being in two places at once as we continue to debate H. Res. 430, which falls into our original jurisdiction here on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 430 comes from a dispute over documents relating to the special counsel's investigation into Russian interference in the 2016 Presidential election. The dispute also stems from the inherent oversight authority of Congress and our ability to perform oversight functions over the executive branch. It falls into the fuzzy boundaries between the branches of governments as to when and how we may compel the executive branch to turn over documents to the legislative branch.

I lay out that framework because there is an important point here that is being lost. The Democratic majority clearly wants to make this dispute entirely about this President, this Attorney General, this White House counsel, this investigation, this subpoena of documents. The Democrats want to focus attention there because they think it helps them politically to do so. But this dispute really shouldn't be about just that. It should, rather, be about the difficult and thorny questions that emerge in a system like ours with three branches of government with checks and balances.

In a sense, what the majority is seeking to do here today is completely unprecedented, both in its intent and in its execution. Consider the only other times the House has filed a lawsuit to seek to enforce a subpoena for documents. It has happened twice before, Mr. Speaker, once in 2007, to seek documents from former White House Counsel Harriet Miers, and again in 2012, to seek documents from then-Attorney General Eric Holder as a result of the congressional investigation into the Fast and Furious scandal.

In both of these cases, the House had already voted to hold both Miers and Holder in contempt of Congress before filing suit, which has not yet happened in this case. In the Miers case, 138 days elapsed from the first document request to the Judiciary Committee voting to hold her in contempt. In the Holder case, it was significantly longer, in that 464 days elapsed from the first document request to the committee voting to hold him in contempt. That was well over a year.

Here, the majority is forcing us to rush forward at a much faster pace. Just 44 days elapsed from the date of the first document request to the Attorney General until the Judiciary Committee voted to hold him in contempt. James Holzhauer has been champion of "Jeopardy!" for longer than that.

I don't understand the majority's haste here. Without exhausting all other options—continuing negotiation, discussion, compromise, and turning to a vote on contempt as the last resort—the majority is, instead, pushing this forward into litigation with the executive branch. In doing so, they may well be placing the House in a position that causes significant long-term damage to the institution.

When this matter goes before the courts, it will do so as a case of first impression and under an untested legal theory. In both the Miers and Holder cases, the House previously voted to hold those two individuals in contempt of Congress. Nothing like that has been done here. Using untested tactics like this could set a dangerous precedent that harms us all, Republicans and Democrats, in the long run.

Finally, I would also note that it is not clear what this resolution will ultimately accomplish. Since the House has not yet exercised all the tools in its tool kit, and since it is not clear that the negotiations with the Justice Department and the White House over the documents at issue are at an end, this whole thing may be nothing more than sound and fury. Indeed, given how quickly the majority is rushing into things, it seems unlikely that the only course of action left in the House is to file a lawsuit.

I strongly urge the majority to continue working with the Justice Department and the White House to find a resolution to these issues without resorting to knee-jerk lawsuits that may ultimately damage the House as an institution.

Today, we are also beginning consideration of H.R. 2740, an appropriations package covering 5 of 12 appropriations bills: Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education; Legislative Branch; Defense; State and Foreign Operations; and Energy and Water Development. These five bills cover over 70 percent of our total discretionary spending for fiscal year 2020.

To be precise, Mr. Speaker, we were to do five bills. At the last moment, the majority pulled the Legislative Branch appropriations bill. I will let them explain why at their leisure.

As a longtime member of the Appropriations Committee, I am pleased that we are beginning to move the appropriations bills to the floor. Unfortunately, the bills before us have numerous flaws, most notably that they are marked to allocation levels that aren't realistic.

As we move forward through the appropriations process, I think we need to be clear about the challenges we face this year.

At the end of September, fiscal year 2019 expires, and sequestration cuts contained in the Budget Control Act of 2011 will automatically take effect for fiscal year 2020. In order to prevent that, we need to come to a bipartisan, bicameral budget deal that the House, the Senate, and the President can all agree on. If we don't, then it doesn't really matter what fake number the House marks to. Sequestration will hit, and our defense budget will automatically be slashed by 11 percent and our nondefense budget by 9 percent below the allocations of 2019.

The spending levels in these appropriations bills are not just ambitious; they are unrealistic. Not only are the funding levels for many of these bills too high, so high that the Senate and the President will never agree to them, but the allocations the Appropriations Committee used reflect the misguided notion that any increase in defense spending must be matched by an increase in nondefense spending that is more than twice as high.

That is simply not a realistic assessment of our national priorities or the fiscal limitations imposed on us by our rising national debt. The defense provision of this bill, for example, comes in at \$8 billion less than the President told us was needed to adequately fund the military, maintain readiness, and be prepared to confront international threats.

After years of severe underfunding of our Armed Forces and at a time when threats are emerging everywhere around the globe, spending less than the administration asks for on defense in order to push more money into domestic programs is not a wise course of action.

I am disappointed that the majority chose to strip out pro-life provisions that have been carried in appropriations bills for years. Instead, they added controversial pro-abortion riders that virtually guarantee no Republican support whatsoever for this package.

As the former chair and current ranking member of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, I am familiar with the need for compromise on that particular piece of legislation. But by pushing forward with blatantly partisan riders like these, the majority is guaranteeing the outcome of these bills: dead on arrival in a Republican-led Senate and no chance of getting a Republican President's signature.

In the coming months, I hope we work through these problems, as we did last year, frankly. If the majority intends to move forward with unrealistic spending levels and insists on maintaining partisan riders, then we are simply guaranteeing a failed appropriations process.

Make no mistake, Mr. Speaker, our failure has consequences. A best-case scenario is a yearlong continuing resolution that funds the government at the exact same level as the current year. That is the best scenario if we fail. The worst-case scenario is another government shutdown or sequestration that automatically cuts all government funding levels. Neither of these is a good outcome for the House as an institution, for the Federal Government, or more importantly, for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, although I cannot support either bill before us today, I am hopeful that, eventually, we will reach a bipartisan, bicameral compromise on spending that the vast majority of Members in this House can support. That requires realistic funding levels and elimination of partisan riders from this package. The spending package before us today may be a worthy starting point, but it will take hard work and compromise to move the final bill that can become law.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to hear from my friend from Oklahoma about both of these bills. We were here together last night until around midnight, working on the rules for these bills.

On H.R. 2740, the appropriations package that we have together, we have authorized more than 100—I think the number is 112—bipartisan amendments. In fact, I think the first amendment is one that is from the gentleman from Oklahoma. We have made that first.

I won't be voting for it. I won't be supporting it, but he has the opportunity to make his case on the floor of the House of Representatives and to present it to colleagues.

We are proud of the fact that there are more than 100 amendments. In fact, I think we are meeting again this afternoon, and we might adopt dozens more amendments, for the consideration of the full House.

But on the question of H. Res. 430, which is to empower the Judiciary

Committee and the other committees in Congress to enforce our right to obtain information that we seek, I think that this should be an overriding, bipartisan commitment within the Article I branch, within the Congress of the United States.

We simply cannot tolerate a posture from the President of the United States—and it is hard for me to think of any other Congress that would tolerate it from any other President—of noncooperation and absolute, comprehensive, and wholesale defiance of the will of Congress in trying to seek information.

My good friend from Oklahoma says that the President does not work to enforce the laws of Congress; he works for the people. Well, we all work for the people. That was my point. His job is to take care that the laws passed by Congress are faithfully executed. We work directly for the people.

At least until we get a national popular vote for President, the President is not elected by the people, as we know from the 2016 election itself where the popular vote winner, who gained several million more votes than Donald Trump did, lost the election because of the workings of the electoral college.

□ 1300

The Presidency was set up as an indirect mechanism, and that is something that I think that we should be replacing. But I think it is not appropriate to claim a popular mandate for the President when the President emerges from the electoral college.

In any event, the President's job is to take care that the laws are faithfully executed and also to be the Commander in Chief in times of actual conflict, but it is up to Congress to legislate. That is what we do. That is why it is so problematic when the President of the United States says:

I will not accept a bipartisan congressional rejection of billions of dollars in funding for my border wall; I am going to declare a national emergency and then reprogram money from other lawfully appropriated purposes.

That is a violation of the spending power of the Congress of the United States. It is just like the President rejecting a bipartisan repudiation of his involvement with the Saudi Government in the Yemeni civil war. We have not declared war with Saudi Arabia against Iran or anybody else in the Yemeni conflict, and so we don't want to be involved in it. We don't want our money going to that bloody humanitarian catastrophe, and yet the President simply rejects the majority will of both Houses of Congress. That is a decisive rejection in defiance of Congress' power to declare war.

Now what we are getting is this complete defiance of our ability to get the information that we need. The President said it very clearly. He basically said: No subpoenas, no witnesses—enough—and no do-overs.

So he is not going to allow us to investigate the compromised security

clearance process and the White House is not going to allow us to investigate the completely suspect corruption and distortion of the constitutional mandate for a Census which we have got to do by virtue of the Constitution every 10 years, and he is not going to cooperate with any investigation into the matters that were covered by Special Counsel Mueller; the organized, systematic comprehensive, sweeping attack on our elections by the GRU and Russian agents or the more than 100 contacts they had with the Trump campaign or the 10 different episodes of Presidential obstruction of justice that were set forth by Special Counsel Mueller in his report.

We can't accept that. So this legislation in H.R. 430 will give us the opportunity to go to court right away to enforce our subpoenas against this unprecedented defiance of congressional power by the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the great State of Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN).

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Oklahoma, and I thank my friend from Maryland who reminds us that our President was constitutionally elected and that our President was elected by the way our Constitution describes and outlines, and we thank our President for the work he is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I cosponsored an amendment with Congressman COLE to remove a dangerous poison pill in the appropriations bill that would block the free exercise of rights for the American people. Congress has long supported robust protections for rights of conscience. The right to follow your conscience on deeply held religious and moral beliefs is a foundational value of our country. In a free society like ours, adherence to one's convictions should not be just tolerated but encouraged. Our forefathers fought like hell to liberate our country from a monarchy that mandated what to believe and how to behave.

How soon we have forgotten. It happens in small increments, with small, minor changes here and there, but they grow larger and more invasive. Someday you will find yourself back under the yoke, with an oppressive government telling you what to believe and how to behave.

This conscience rule is absolutely necessary to preserve the freedom of expression that we hold dear in our country. The rider in the Labor HHS bill eliminating this rule is a poison pill and does not belong in an appropriations package.

The Trump administration has vigorously supported the right for our people to act on their religious and moral convictions. President Trump's leadership on this issue has encouraged mil-

lions of Americans who have seen these protections start to slip away in the past decade.

Who are we to force people to act against their convictions and religious beliefs?

It is a slippery slope to despotism, but I think some of our colleagues would have us go down that road in pursuit of some greater good. I can assure you that forcing the American people to work against their convictions and beliefs will lead us to nothing but destruction, and I guarantee that this bill will never be signed into law if this language remains.

This amendment must be made in order so that we can debate it and remove the poison pill from the final bill. Otherwise, the time my colleagues have spent on the Labor HHS bill is a giant waste of time because it will never make it to the President's desk.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, all of us, of course, embrace and uphold the First Amendment and the rights of religious freedom, the right to not have government establish a religion and to participate in the free exercise of religion and to worship or to not worship exactly as you please. There is nothing in any of our legislation that would interfere with anybody's right to exercise precisely their religious preference to worship exactly as they please and to belong to whatever religious faith or denomination they want.

I am not quite sure exactly what the gentleman was referring to. We know that the idea of a religious freedom to discriminate has been asserted ever since the 1960s with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 where the hotel and motel, lunch counter and department store owners said that they had a religious right to only serve the customers that they wanted and that it violated their religious faith to have interracial parties seated in restaurants or at the lunch counter. Our Supreme Court rejected that, and this Congress has rejected that.

There have been similar efforts to say we have a constitutional right not to serve gay and lesbian customers. That has been rejected, and I hope that this Congress will also reject it.

We passed the Equality Act very proudly to add protection for LGBT people to the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and I hope that the Senate will go along with it.

In any event, there is nothing in any of the legislation before us and none has been cited which violates any of the free exercise rights of the people. So with that, unless I hear anything further, I am not moved by how anybody is affected by this appropriation negatively.

My other good friend from Oklahoma referenced the phrase checks and balances, and that does appear in the Federalist Papers. I think it is in Federalist 51. It actually refers to the relationship between the House and the

Senate. That was the design of the Framers of the Constitution that the House and the Senate would check and balance each other. But the Framers were very clear that we were overthrowing monarchy. We didn't want monarchy. That is why we got rid of the king. The revolutionaries and the rebels who gave us America and who wrote the Constitution were trying to institute a new form of government representing We the People. That is why we are so proud to be able to serve in the people's House here along with our friends in the Senate.

But the President's core job is to take care that our laws are faithfully executed. We have no kings here; we have no monarchs here. That is why we have the Emoluments Clause in the Constitution which says that none of us who serves in Washington can accept any present—any emoluments, which just means a payment—any office or title from a prince, a king, or a foreign government without the consent of Congress.

That is a cardinal principle in the Constitution. It is our original anti-corruption principle because the Framers did not want the President or Members of Congress selling out the country. They wanted complete, undivided loyalty by those of us who come to Washington, who aspire and obtain the public office to have complete, undivided loyalty to the American people and not to lobbyists for foreign governments, agents, and saboteurs.

So that is another real problem that this President seems not to recognize. That provision obligates him whenever he receives any money from a foreign government through his hotel or his office towers or any of his going businesses that he has kept going in the course of his tenure, whenever he receives any of that money, he has got to come to Congress to ask for our permission and for our consent.

Mr. Speaker, we can show you records from lots of prior Presidents who came to Congress to ask for a consent because they received a Persian rug, or a shawl, or cufflinks. Yet—at least according to court reports and media reports—this President has been receiving hundreds of thousands of dollars or millions of dollars from foreign governments. In fact, the President I think made a voluntary deposit he said of the profits from foreign government receipts of \$350,000 to the U.S. Treasury without any accounting to us, without any receipts, and without asking for our consent.

So even if the Constitution says that you can't accept the profits from foreign payments, which it doesn't, it says you can't accept foreign payments. That would be insufficient because Congress has got to offer its consent.

Look, we need to lay down the law about all of these matters. When we ask for a document, we want the document. When we issue a subpoena from the United States Congress, you comply with the subpoena. When we ask for

a witness, the witness arrives. That is what H.R. 430 is all about. We have got to empower Congress to enforce its will.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH). My good friend is the most eloquent advocate for life in this Chamber.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule.

Earlier this year, Mr. Speaker, President Trump made it clear in a letter that he will veto any piece of legislation that undermines or nullifies any pro-life policy, regulation, or rule.

The bill facilitated by this rule reverses several life-affirming pro-life policies, including conscience protection, Title X reform, the protecting life in global health assistance, and more.

No one, Mr. Speaker—including doctors, nurses, and LPNs—and no entity like a hospital or a health insurance plan should ever be compelled against their will into performing, facilitating, or subsidizing abortion.

First, the approps bill overturns the conscience protection final rule, leaving many at risk of pressure, harassment and coercion.

Second, in late February, HHS promulgated the Protect Life Rule to reassert portions of President Ronald Reagan's Title X rule, including ending co-location of abortion clinics with family planning clinics subsidized by Title X.

Third, H.R. 2740, the underlying bill, repeals and bans future promulgation by any President of protecting life in global health assistance, a significant reiteration and expansion of President Reagan's Mexico City policy, a policy designed to ensure that U.S. taxpayers are not funding foreign NGOs that perform or promote abortion as a method of family planning.

Mr. Speaker, why is this so important? Because women and children, both home and abroad, deserve better than the violence of abortion.

The humanity of the unborn child is beyond doubt, yet the pro-abortion movement, like some kind of modern-day flat Earth society, continues to cling to outdated, indefensible arguments cloaked in euphemism. Even the seemingly benign word "choice" withers under scrutiny.

Choice to do what?

Dismember a baby?

Take pills to starve a child to death and then forcibly expel her or him from the womb?

Inject chemical poisons that kill the baby?

At the end of this process, Mr. Speaker, important policies embedded in the approps bill will be signed into law, but reversal of pro-life policies will be vetoed. This legislation will be vetoed and the veto will be sustained by this Congress.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I still have not heard a single instance offered from anybody whose religious freedoms under the Constitution of the United States are threatened by any of the legislation here.

I do know that the ultimate logic of the argument that we just heard here is to support legislation like what was just passed in the State of Alabama. In Alabama today—please read an article in the Washington Post this morning, Mr. Speaker—in Alabama today if this legislation is signed into law, a 15-year-old girl who is raped by her step-uncle not only would not be able to obtain an abortion, because there is no exception for rape or incest in the ban that the legislature just passed, but she would be compelled to have him involved in the raising of the child because Alabama protects the paternity rights of the rapist. So it is one of only two States in the country where a rapist continues to have parenthood rights in the child.

So get this straight. If what we are hearing is actually enacted into law—and I understand my colleagues to be encouraging legislation like this around the country, like the law in Alabama—we will have a situation where girls who are 15 or 14 or 13 or 16 years old who are raped by their step-fathers or step-uncles must carry a child to term, have the baby, and in some States be forced to raise the baby with the rapist.

So I don't think that is where we are today in America under Planned Parenthood v. Casey and Roe v. Wade, and certainly the majority is going to stand very strong for healthcare for women and reproductive freedom for women and men to make their own decisions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, there is a document that I hold in my hand that covers the epidemic apparently that is taking siege over America. It contains the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

The Declaration of Independence paraphrases we are all created equal with certain inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

□ 1315

I am honored to serve in this body and, with honor, walk through the halls and look at the historical depictions of the early years.

Just coming back from D-Day in Normandy, I am reminded of the brave men and, certainly, women who served in the United States military, supporters in World War II, but, in particular, the men who stormed the Normandy beach.

I am reminded, I am sure, of the words of General Dwight D. Eisenhower, who said: The world is watching, and they will join you in marching to victory.

This Constitution has the Ninth Amendment, the right to privacy. It has the right to freedom of religion and freedom of access and freedom of speech. And all that is being done here today is to acknowledge not only the poor 15-year-old, 13-year-old, and 14-year-old that my good friend from Maryland talked about, but, all over the country, denying poor women access to health services that should really be based upon their faith, their God, their family, and their medical provider.

In some of the bills in Missouri and in some of the bills that are being proposed in Georgia, Alabama, and in my own State of Texas, it is litigation that would get you healthcare. It is no respect of the individual human being, the person, who may have to go back to the antics of yesteryear, dealing with the tactics of coat hangers of which many of us are aware.

Let me also say that underlying in this rule is the opportunity for the force of the authority of the Article I Congress to enforce individuals to come before congressional committees, such as the Committee on the Judiciary, which we will debate later.

It is invested in this Constitution, because of Article I authority and the collegial response that the Founding Fathers wanted us to have, that there are no unequal branches—there is a number one branch—and one branch should not ignore and disrespect the other branch.

Therefore, if Article I branch, which we are in, asks for witnesses and then is blocked by another branch that has no greater status—read the Constitution.

In this rule, we have tried to correct the imbalance and inappropriateness that is occurring in this body and in this process, and so I ask my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying legislation to restore the Constitution.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GONZALEZ).

Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule that would provide for consideration of H.R. 2740. This package provides funding for several items that would benefit my district in northeast Ohio, but it falls short in several key regards, including funding for key programs that would help keep our children safe.

In particular, Mr. Speaker, this package fails to provide adequate funding for the School Safety National Activities program, which gives grants to schools to support safe learning environments, including programs to combat substance abuse and cultivate academic success.

This bill provides \$80 million less in funding than what the administration requested. I offered an amendment to raise that number by \$10 million, but

my colleagues in the majority blocked it from consideration.

I think we can all agree that school safety is of the utmost importance and an area that is vital for Congress to invest in. I hope my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will work with me to assure that programs to protect our children, like the School Safety National Activities program, remain a congressional priority.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER).

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Oklahoma for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to strongly oppose the rule and spending package being debated before us. Not only does this massive spending package blow our budget caps by nearly \$200 billion, but this flawed legislation severely undermines critical protections for the lives of the unborn.

I am very proud of the work that the Trump administration has been doing to finally make Title X about family planning and not a way of using taxpayer money to fund abortions. The administration's new Title X provisions draw a bright line between abortion and family planning, while ensuring taxpayer dollars are put towards comprehensive, preventive, and primary care for women.

These new regulations will also make it easier for faith-based clinics to provide care through the Title X program, which will expand access to care for families. Yet, under this partisan piece of legislation, these protections are stripped and taxpayer funding for abortion clinics is increased. This is unacceptable.

The fight to give a voice to the unborn will not be swayed by partisan poison pills. I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and the underlying bill.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule immediately to bring up H.R. 3056 for consideration under an open rule.

The bill provides \$4.5 billion of funding to address the immediate humanitarian crisis on the southern border. This is a crisis of significant proportions, Mr. Speaker.

Our facilities for holding new arrivals, particularly children and the vulnerable unaccompanied minors, are already at the breaking point. Simply put, we need more resources, and we need them today.

This is not the first time we have needed to provide supplemental appropriations for this purpose. Back in 2014, then-President Barack Obama asked us for \$3.7 billion in supplemental resources for precisely the same purpose. He got it. At the time, we had 60,000 unaccompanied minors who arrived in 2014. We face a similar and, frankly, larger humanitarian crisis today.

President Obama was right to request supplemental funds to deal with the crisis then. We would be right to appropriate supplemental funds to address that similar crisis now.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this rule. The rule demonstrates once again that the Democrat majority refuses to acknowledge, accept, or address the very real crisis at our southern border.

New numbers recently came out illustrating the magnitude of the crisis. CBP detained more than 144,000 migrants in the month of May. This was the third consecutive month when we had in excess of 100,000 migrants detained at the border: 101,000 in March, 109,000 in April, and 144,000 in May. We are on track to apprehend over 1 million migrants this fiscal year, approximately the population of Austin, Texas.

Smugglers and cartels continue to preach that now is the time to come to the United States. They call children "permisos," or permits, and exploit them to get scores of adults unrelated to the children across the border.

These criminal organizations run an international smuggling operation filled with misery and abuse. Migrants who survive the smugglers often arrive in poor health, physically exhausted, and in need of urgent medical care.

The men and women of CBP are doing the best they can to respond to this humanitarian crisis, but they have run out of space to safely house and process the unprecedented numbers of family units seeking entry into the United States. In the next couple of weeks, Health and Human Services will run out of funds to feed and shelter the vulnerable unaccompanied children.

Four weeks ago, the President and Congress sent an urgent request for supplemental appropriations to address this crisis. Ranking Member GRANGER and I filed an amendment to the mini-bus which would have provided the \$4.5 billion requested by the President.

It would have replenished critical funds needed to feed and shelter migrant families and unaccompanied children. It would have provided urgent medical care and transportation services, and it would pay the growing cost of overtime for the men and women of DHS working on the front lines of this crisis.

Unfortunately, for the third time in the last month, the majority refused to make our amendment in order. Democrats haven't approved a dime for this crisis.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. ROGERS of Alabama. Because of the political dysfunction in their own Caucus, they stubbornly refuse to put forward any solutions. It has gotten to the point where editorial boards in some of the Nation's most liberal cities are now calling Democrats out for their inaction.

Democrats need to stop denying the facts and blaming the President for this crisis. The time has come to face reality and work with the President and Republicans in Congress to immediately resolve this humanitarian crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to defeat the previous question on this rule. If we do that, we can finally bring this critically needed supplemental funding to the House for a vote.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, my friend made reference a little bit earlier to amendments. He talked about the total number of amendments, but he left out the distribution of amendments. So, as the House considers this rule, I think we ought to take a look at how the Rules Committee has handled making amendments in order so far this Congress.

The rule on the floor today is making 106 amendments in order, out of 540 submitted, with hopefully more to come with tomorrow's rule.

Today's rule includes 22 amendments sponsored solely by Republicans. Sadly, this is considered an improvement over the majority's previous efforts.

With today's rule, in total, this Congress, 73 percent of all amendments made in order have been sponsored solely by Democrats—73 percent. Just 16 percent are sponsored by Republicans, with 11 percent bipartisan.

How does this compare with the last Congress? When Republicans were the majority party, 45 percent of all amendments made in order were sponsored solely by Democrats. Only 38 percent were sponsored solely by Republicans, with another 17 percent being bipartisan.

At the beginning of this Congress, the Democratic majority repeatedly promised a new, robust, and open process at the Rules Committee. They pledged that good ideas would be welcomed, no matter where they came from, and that thoughtful amendments would not be blocked.

Unfortunately, they have a long way to go to keep that promise. I think the numbers speak volumes.

We are 5 months into the 116th Congress. Should we expect this trend of shutting out minority party ideas to continue? Should we expect the same course of action in our rule tomorrow and in our rule on the second appropriations package next week and in

other rules in the weeks and months to come?

When will the promises made by the Democratic majority be kept? If not now, when?

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I urge opposition to the rule. The rule will make in order two measures: H. Res. 430 and H.R. 2740.

H. Res. 430 is a premature and ineffective resolution that will push the House forward into untested and ill-timed litigation with the executive branch over the subpoena of documents. While the House has an important oversight role to play, we must be careful to exercise that role wisely and carefully, lest we cause long-term damage to the institution.

H.R. 2740 is a package of 5 of the 12 outstanding appropriations bills that use unrealistic allocation levels and eliminate longstanding pro-life protections that must be restored before these bills can garner any Republican support.

I actually look forward to working with my colleagues in the House and the Senate as we move forward in the appropriations process, and I urge the majority to compromise with the Senate and the White House in order to achieve a final spending deal that avoids drastic sequestration cuts or, worse yet, another government shutdown.

I think that is actually the great lesson of the appropriations process, Mr. Speaker. We know we can do this. We did it last year, and we did it pretty well together.

But my friends have to get past the idea that they can impose their will on a Republican Senate and a Republican President. They are simply not going to be able to do that. They are going to have to bargain to a middle ground and compromise.

In the Appropriations Committee, as a rule, we do that, and we do it pretty well. I am hopeful that we can continue going forward on that front.

I am concerned, however, that the vitriol, if you will, that we see in the investigative and oversight efforts of our friends will spill into that process and lead us into a very difficult situation in September.

So, as we move forward on the appropriations front, again, I hope all of us relearn the virtues of compromise, understand that we were all sent here by the American people, that we have to work with one another to accomplish something, and that none of us can impose their will on the other.

With that, I look forward to working with my friend and with his colleagues and, certainly, through the appropriations process to making sure that the government is appropriately funded and well governed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1330

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is a pleasure to work with the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE) on H.R. 2740 and H.R. 4340, and I do urge all of our colleagues to support this rule for this legislation.

I do hope my friend from Oklahoma will tutor some of his colleagues, like the last speaker, who referred to the "Democrat majority." Democrat is the noun. Democratic is the adjective for our party, and I think that would be a basic gesture of interparty civility if they would follow that fairly easy grammatical device.

Mr. Speaker, one of the other Members from the other side, I think from Oklahoma, talked about some education matters, so I want to go to some statistics that actually mean something to the American people. I think we can refute all of the statistics that were advanced by my friend from Oklahoma, as I said.

There are more than 100 amendments that we are going to be bringing up today, and we are going to be adding more of them, and we certainly don't want to endure lectures from people who belong to the caucus that ran the most closed Congress in the history of the United States.

But here are some figures that actually mean something to the American people. Our bill provides a total of \$75.9 billion in appropriations for the Education Department, which is \$4.5 billion above the 2019-enacted level, and \$11.9 billion beyond what the President asked for. So that means dramatic increases in everything from IDEA special education spending, to education, innovation, and research programs, to spending for teacher professional development evidence-based models and so on.

We are also increasing money for student financial assistance for Pell Grants for higher education, because it has become too difficult for our young people to make their way through college, and they are graduating, basically, with a mortgage of 100 or \$150,000, but they don't have a house to go with it. So this majority is committed to alleviating the burden on America's college students.

Mr. Speaker, we are trying to make progress, under very difficult circumstances with this President, for the American people in the realm of education, healthcare, scientific and medical research. We are making that progress, and I urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation.

I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 431

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 8. That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall resolve into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3056) to provide supplemental appropriations relating to border security, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of

order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are waived. Clause 2(e) of rule XXI shall not apply during consideration of the bill. When the committee rises and reports the bill back to the House with a recommendation that the bill do pass, the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC 9. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3056.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adoption of the resolution, if ordered; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 190, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 245]

YEAS—227

Adams	Cleaver	Eshoo
Aguilar	Clyburn	Españillat
Allred	Cohen	Evans
Barragán	Connolly	Pinkenauer
Bass	Cooper	Fletcher
Beatty	Correa	Foster
Bera	Costa	Frankel
Beyer	Courtney	Fudge
Bishop (GA)	Cox (CA)	Gabbard
Blumenauer	Craig	Gallego
Blunt Rochester	Crist	Garamendi
Bonamici	Crow	García (IL)
Boyle, Brendan	Cuellar	García (TX)
F.	Cummings	Golden
Brindisi	Cunningham	Gomez
Brown (MD)	Davids (KS)	Gonzalez (TX)
Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny K.	Green (TX)
Bustos	Dean	Grijalva
Butterfield	DeFazio	Haaland
Carbajal	DeGette	Harder (CA)
Cárdenas	DeLauro	Hayes
Carson (IN)	DelBene	Heck
Cartwright	Delgado	Higgins (NY)
Case	Demings	Hill (CA)
Casten (IL)	DeSaulnier	Himes
Castor (FL)	Deutch	Horn, Kendra S.
Castro (TX)	Dingell	Horsford
Chu, Judy	Doggett	Houlahan
Cicilline	Doyle, Michael	Hoyer
Cisneros	F.	Huffman
Clark (MA)	Engel	Jackson Lee
Clarke (NY)	Escobar	Jayapal

Jeffries	Meng	Scott (VA)	Smith (MO)	Thornberry	Webster (FL)	McAdams	Pressley	Stanton
Johnson (GA)	Moore	Scott, David	Smith (NE)	Timmons	Wenstrup	McBath	Price (NC)	Stevens
Johnson (TX)	Morelle	Serrano	Smith (NJ)	Tipton	Westerman	McCollum	Quigley	Suozi
Kaptur	Moulton	Sewell (AL)	Smucker	Turner	Williams	McEachin	Raskin	Swalwell (CA)
Keating	Mucarsel-Powell	Shalala	Spano	Upton	Wilson (SC)	McGovern	Rice (NY)	Takano
Kelly (IL)	Murphy	Sherman	Stauber	Wagner	Wittman	McNerney	Richmond	Thompson (CA)
Kennedy	Nadler	Sherrill	Stefanik	Walberg	Womack	Meeks	Rose (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Khanna	Napolitano	Sires	Steil	Walden	Woodall	Meng	Rouda	Titus
Kildee	Neal	Slotkin	Steube	Walker	Yoho	Moore	Roybal-Allard	Tlaib
Kilmer	Neguse	Smith (WA)	Stewart	Walorski	Young	Morelle	Ruiz	Tonko
Kim	Norcross	Soto	Stivers	Waltz	Zeldin	Moulton	Ruppersberger	Torres (CA)
Kind	O'Halleran	Spanberger	Taylor	Watkins		Mucarsel-Powell	Rush	Torres Small
Kirkpatrick	Ocasio-Cortez	Speier	Thompson (PA)	Weber (TX)		Murphy	Sánchez	(NM)
Krishnamoorthi	Omar	Stanton				Nadler	Sarbanes	Trahan
Lamb	Pallone	Stevens	Axne	Gottheimer	King (IA)	Napolitano	Scanlon	Trone
Langevin	Panetta	Suozi	Bost	Green (TN)	Kuster (NH)	Neal	Schakowsky	Trone
Larsen (WA)	Pappas	Swalwell (CA)	Buck	Griffith	Long	Neguse	Schiff	Underwood
Larson (CT)	Pascrell	Takano	Clay	Hastings	Ryan	Norcross	Schneider	Van Drew
Lawrence	Payne	Thompson (CA)	Davis (CA)	Herrera Beutler	Wright	O'Halleran	Schrader	Vargas
Lawson (FL)	Perlmutter	Thompson (MS)				Ocasio-Cortez	Schrier	Veasey
Lee (CA)	Peters	Titus				Omar	Scott (VA)	Vela
Lee (NV)	Peterson	Tlaib				Pallone	Scott, David	Velázquez
Levin (CA)	Phillips	Tonko				Panetta	Serrano	Visclosky
Levin (MI)	Pingree	Torres (CA)				Pappas	Sewell (AL)	Wasserman
Lewis	Pocan	Torres Small				Pascrell	Shalala	Schultz
Lieu, Ted	Porter	(NM)				Payne	Sherman	Waters
Lipinski	Pressley	Trahan				Perlmutter	Sherrill	Watson Coleman
Loebach	Price (NC)	Trone				Peters	Sires	Welch
Lofgren	Quigley	Underwood				Peterson	Slotkin	Wexton
Lowenthal	Raskin	Van Drew				Phillips	Smith (WA)	Wild
Lowey	Rice (NY)	Vargas				Pingree	Soto	Wilson (FL)
Luján	Richmond	Veasey				Pocan	Spanberger	Yarmuth
Luria	Rose (NY)	Vela				Porter	Speier	
Lynch	Rouda	Velázquez						
Malinowski	Roybal-Allard	Ruiz						
Maloney,	Ruppersberger	Visclosky						
Carolyn B.	Rush	Wasserman						
Maloney, Sean	Sánchez	Schultz						
Matsui	Sarbanes	Waters						
McAdams	Scanlon	Watson Coleman						
McBath	Schakowsky	Welch						
McCollum	Schiff	Wexton						
McEachin	Schneider	Wild						
McGovern	Schrader	Wilson (FL)						
McNerney	Schrier	Yarmuth						
Meeks								

NAYS—190

Abraham	Ferguson	Latta
Aderholt	Fitzpatrick	Lesko
Allen	Fleischmann	Loudermilk
Amash	Flores	Lucas
Amodei	Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer
Armstrong	Fox (NC)	Marchant
Arrington	Fulcher	Marshall
Babin	Gaetz	Massie
Bacon	Gallagher	Mast
Baird	Gianforte	McCarthy
Balderson	Gibbs	McCaul
Banks	Gohmert	McClintock
Barr	Gonzalez (OH)	McHenry
Bergman	Gooden	McKinley
Biggs	Gosar	Meadows
Bilirakis	Granger	Meuser
Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Miller
Brady	Graves (LA)	Mitchell
Brooks (AL)	Graves (MO)	Moolenaar
Brooks (IN)	Grothman	Mooney (WV)
Buchanan	Guest	Mullin
Bucshon	Guthrie	Newhouse
Budd	Hagedorn	Norman
Burchett	Harris	Nunes
Burgess	Hartzler	Olson
Byrne	Hern, Kevin	Palazzo
Calvert	Hice (GA)	Palmer
Carter (GA)	Higgins (LA)	Pence
Carter (TX)	Hill (AR)	Perry
Chabot	Holding	Posey
Cheney	Hollingsworth	Ratcliffe
Cline	Hudson	Reed
Cloud	Huizenga	Reschenthaler
Cole	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Collins (GA)	Hurd (TX)	Riggleman
Collins (NY)	Johnson (LA)	Roby
Comer	Johnson (OH)	Rodgers (WA)
Conaway	Johnson (SD)	Roe, David P.
Cook	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Crawford	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Joyce (PA)	Rooney (FL)
Curtis	Katko	Rose, John W.
Davidson (OH)	Keller	Rouzer
Davis, Rodney	Kelly (MS)	Roy
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
Diaz-Balart	King (NY)	Scallise
Duffy	Kinzing	Schweikert
Duncan	Kustoff (TN)	Scott, Austin
Dunn	LaHood	Sensenbrenner
Emmer	LaMalfa	Shimkus
Estes	Lamborn	Simpson

NOT VOTING—15

Green (TX)	King (IA)
Griffith	Kuster (NH)
Hastings	Long
Herrera Beutler	Ryan
	Wright

□ 1402

Messrs. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee, BILIRAKIS, and FORTENBERRY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. LANGEVIN changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 190, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 246]

YEAS—227

Adams	Cummings	Horsford
Aguilar	Cunningham	Houlahan
Allred	Davids (KS)	Hoyer
Barragán	Davis, Danny K.	Huffman
Bass	Dean	Jackson Lee
Beatty	DeFazio	Jayapal
Bera	DeGette	Jeffries
Beyer	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Bishop (GA)	DelBene	Johnson (TX)
Blumenauer	Delgado	Kaptur
Blunt Rochester	Demings	Keating
Bonamici	DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Deutch	Kennedy
Brindisi	Dingell	Khanna
Brown (MD)	Doggett	Kildee
Brownley (CA)	Doyle, Michael F.	Kilmer
Bustos	Engel	Kim
Butterfield	Escobar	Kind
Carbajal	Eshoo	Kirkpatrick
Cárdenas	Españillat	Krishnamoorthi
Carson (IN)	Evans	Lamb
Cartwright	Finkenauer	Langevin
Case	Fletcher	Larsen (WA)
Casten (IL)	Foster	Larson (CT)
Castor (FL)	Frankel	Lawrence
Castro (TX)	Fudge	Lawson (FL)
Chu, Judy	Gabbard	Lee (CA)
Cicilline	Gallego	Lee (NV)
Cisneros	Garamendi	Levin (CA)
Clark (MA)	Garcia (IL)	Levin (MI)
Clarke (NY)	Garcia (TX)	Lewis
Cleaver	Golden	Lieu, Ted
Clyburn	Gomez	Lipinski
Cohen	Gonzalez (TX)	Loebach
Connolly	Green (TX)	Lofgren
Cooper	Grijalva	Lowenthal
Correa	Haaland	Lowe
Costa	Harder (CA)	Luján
Courtney	Hayes	Luria
Cox (CA)	Heck	Lynch
Craig	Higgins (NY)	Malinowski
Crist	Hill (CA)	Maloney,
Crow	Himes	Carolyn B.
Cuellar	Horn, Kendra S.	Matsui

NAYS—190

Abraham	Gooden	Palmer
Aderholt	Gosar	Pence
Allen	Granger	Perry
Amash	Graves (GA)	Posey
Amodei	Graves (LA)	Ratcliffe
Armstrong	Graves (MO)	Reed
Arrington	Grothman	Reschenthaler
Babin	Guest	Rice (SC)
Bacon	Guthrie	Riggleman
Baird	Hagedorn	Roby
Balderson	Harris	Rodgers (WA)
Banks	Hartzler	Roe, David P.
Barr	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (AL)
Bergman	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Biggs	Higgins (LA)	Rooney (FL)
Bilirakis	Hill (AR)	Rose, John W.
Bishop (UT)	Holding	Rouzer
Brady	Hollingsworth	Roy
Brooks (AL)	Hudson	Rutherford
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga	Scalise
Buchanan	Hunter	Schweikert
Bucshon	Hurd (TX)	Scott, Austin
Budd	Johnson (LA)	Sensenbrenner
Burchett	Johnson (OH)	Shimkus
Burgess	Johnson (SD)	Simpson
Byrne	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Calvert	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NE)
Carter (GA)	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Carter (TX)	Katko	Smucker
Chabot	Keller	Spano
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Stauber
Cline	Kelly (PA)	Stefanik
Cloud	King (NY)	Steil
Cole	Kinzing	Steube
Collins (GA)	Kustoff (TN)	Stewart
Collins (NY)	LaHood	Stivers
Comer	LaMalfa	Taylor
Conaway	Lamborn	Thompson (PA)
Cook	Latta	Thornberry
Crawford	Lesko	Timmons
Crenshaw	Loudermilk	Tipton
Curtis	Lucas	Turner
Davidson (OH)	Luetkemeyer	Upton
Davis, Rodney	Marchant	Wagner
DesJarlais	Marshall	Walberg
Diaz-Balart	Massie	Walden
Duffy	Mast	Walker
Duncan	McCarthy	Walorski
Dunn	McCaul	Waltz
Emmer	McClintock	Watkins
Estes	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	McKinley	Webster (FL)
Fitzpatrick	Meadows	Wenstrup
Fleischmann	Meuser	Westerman
Flores	Miller	Williams
Fortenberry	Mitchell	Wilson (SC)
Fox (NC)	Moolenaar	Wittman
Fulcher	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Gaetz	Mullin	Woodall
Gallagher	Newhouse	Yoho
Gianforte	Norman	Young
Gibbs	Nunes	Zeldin
Gohmert	Olson	
Gonzalez (OH)	Palazzo	

NOT VOTING—15

Axne	Gottheimer	King (IA)
Bost	Green (TN)	Kuster (NH)
Buck	Griffith	Long
Clay	Hastings	Ryan
Davis (CA)	Herrera Beutler	Wright

□ 1412

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BUTTERFIELD). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. BUDD. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

AUTHORIZING THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO INITIATE OR INTERVENE IN JUDICIAL PROCEEDINGS TO ENFORCE CERTAIN SUBPOENAS

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 431, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 430) authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Rules, printed in the resolution, is adopted, and the resolution, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the resolution, as amended, is as follows:

H. RES. 430

That the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives is author-

ized, on behalf of such Committee, to initiate or intervene in any judicial proceeding before a Federal court—

(1) to seek declaratory judgments and any and all ancillary relief, including injunctive relief, affirming the duty of—

(A) William P. Barr, Attorney General, to comply with the subpoena that is the subject of the resolution accompanying House Report 116-105; and

(B) Donald F. McGahn, II, former White House Counsel, to comply with the subpoena issued to him on April 22, 2019; and

(2) to petition for disclosure of information regarding any matters identified in or relating to the subpoenas referred to in paragraph (1) or any accompanying report, pursuant to Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 6(e), including Rule 6(e)(3)(E) (providing that the court may authorize disclosure of a grand-jury matter "preliminarily to... a judicial proceeding").

Resolved, That the chair of each standing and permanent select committee, when authorized by the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, retains the ability to initiate or intervene in any judicial proceeding before a Federal court on behalf of such committee, to seek declaratory judgments and any and all ancillary relief, including injunctive relief, affirming the duty of the recipient of any subpoena duly issued by that committee to comply with that subpoena. Consistent with the Congressional Record statement on January 3, 2019, by the chair of the Committee on Rules regarding the civil enforcement of subpoenas pursuant to clause 8(b) of rule II, a vote of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group to authorize litigation and to articulate the institutional position of the House in that litigation is the equivalent of a vote of the full House of Representatives.

Resolved, That in connection with any judicial proceeding brought under the first or second resolving clauses, the chair of any standing or permanent select committee exercising authority thereunder has any and all necessary authority under Article I of the Constitution.

Resolved, That the chair of any standing or permanent select committee exercising authority described in the first or second resolving clause shall notify the House of Representatives, with respect to the commencement of any judicial proceeding thereunder.

Resolved, That the Office of General Counsel of the House of Representatives shall, with the authorization of the Speaker, represent any standing or permanent select committee in any judicial proceeding initiated or intervened in pursuant to the authority described in the first or second resolving clause.

Resolved, That the Office of General Counsel of the House of Representatives is authorized to retain private counsel, either for pay or pro bono, to assist in the representation of any standing or permanent select committee in any judicial proceeding initiated or intervened in pursuant to the authority described in the first or second resolving clause.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The resolution, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules.

The gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) and the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H. Res. 430.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a dark time. This Congress is being tested—in this case, not by a foreign adversary but by our own President, a President who is undertaking a relentless campaign of obstruction and stonewalling.

We have never seen anything like this. Never before, Mr. Speaker, has a President from either party so flagrantly ignored Congress' constitutional oversight authority and our Nation's separation of powers.

You don't have to take my word for it. President Trump has declared, "We are fighting all the subpoenas," and, "I don't want people testifying." These words make Richard Nixon look like an Eagle Scout.

His Attorney General, William Barr, is apparently more than willing to follow the President's command. He has refused to release the full, unredacted Mueller report and any underlying evidence until a compromise was finally reached yesterday. That is after the Judiciary Committee had already voted to hold him in contempt of Congress. Apparently, the Attorney General went from being America's lawyer to being the defense counsel for the President of the United States.

I hope the Justice Department acts in good faith on this new agreement. These are documents that Congress needs to see in response to Special Counsel Mueller's findings. But if they do not, and if the Attorney General holds back key information, then all options need to be on the table, including enforcing these subpoenas. That is in addition to the fact that some documents and testimony we deserve to obtain could very well fall outside the bounds of this agreement.

The Mueller report is just the tip of the iceberg. The President is using every trick in the book, including false claims of executive privilege, absolute immunity, and lack of legitimate legislative purpose, all to obstruct legitimate inquiries into matters that impact Americans' daily lives. This includes the President's attack on affordable healthcare coverage for millions of Americans, including those with pre-existing conditions; his family separation policy that has torn apart vulnerable immigrant families; his misappropriation of military funds for his offensive border wall; and his decision to roll back landmark civil rights protections.

This is exactly the sort of concentrated power in the hands of the few that the Founders intentionally prevented through the creation of the three separate but coequal branches of government, each branch with unique powers and responsibilities and each branch expected to act as a check on the power of the others.

But the President is trying to take this balance of power and centralize it

in one place, 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. He is acting as though the law applies to every American but himself.

The President's strategy here is clear. Tweet by tweet, quote by quote, he has laid it bare for all of us to see.

The question is whether this Congress will have the courage to take a stand against it and whether we will confront it for what it is, an attack on the very notion of Congress as a co-equal branch of government. I can't speak for my friends on the other side of the aisle, but this Democratic majority will not allow this President to turn a blind eye to the rule of law.

That is why I introduced this measure, H. Res. 430. It is a civil enforcement resolution that will strengthen our hand in court as Congress tries to get the documents this administration is currently trying to hide, so we can uncover the truth and follow the facts, wherever they may lead.

The first part of this resolution follows past precedent used by Democratic and Republican majorities, this time to allow the Judiciary Committee to go to court to enforce subpoenas issued to the Attorney General and former White House General Counsel Don McGahn.

The second part reaffirms key language in House rules, making clear that every committee chair retains the ability to go to Federal court to seek civil enforcement of their subpoenas when authorized by the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group. That includes those already issued, as well as any future subpoenas.

I know some of my colleagues on the other side will be quick to claim this resolution is unprecedented. To them, I would ask this: What is the precedent for an administration refusing to comply with any congressional oversight—no documents, no information, nothing? There isn't one.

We have never seen anything like this before, so we need an appropriate response like this because of this administration's constant obstruction.

I am proud that my fellow committee chairs quickly joined in cosponsoring this resolution, including Oversight and Reform Committee Chairman CUMMINGS, Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman ENGEL, Judiciary Committee Chairman NADLER, Ways and Means Committee Chairman NEAL, Intelligence Committee Chairman SCHIFF, and Financial Services Committee Chairwoman WATERS.

I urge all of my colleagues to join us. This deserves support from both sides of the aisle.

I know the silence from some of my Republican friends to what this President is doing has been deafening, but this moment demands you finally speak up and say enough is enough. This resolution is not about politics or partisanship. It is about defending the rule of law and the very notion of separation of powers.

The challenge here is so great that if we don't stand up to President Trump

today, then we risk losing the power to stand up to any President in the future.

I strongly urge my colleagues: Let's make clear that the law still matters, even in Donald Trump's America. We can do that by voting "yes" on this resolution and making clear that no one is above the law, not even the President of the United States.

Let's do right by the American people. Let's restore the dignity of this institution. Let's pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition of H. Res. 430.

It is disappointing that we are here again debating a measure that will have absolutely no impact on the lives of our constituents. Instead of fixing pressing issues like the security and humanitarian crisis at our southern border, the Democrats continue their focus on influencing the 2020 election at taxpayer expense. Americans are tired of this witch hunt.

For nearly 2 years, Democrats claimed that the President colluded with the Russians to interfere in the 2016 Presidential election. After 22 months, 2,800 subpoenas, 500 warrants, 40 FBI agents, and spending \$35 million, Special Counsel Mueller concluded there was no collusion between President Trump and Russia and did not charge him with obstruction.

Yet, my Democratic colleagues continue to attempt to undermine the President of the United States because, all I can think of is, they haven't accepted the fact that he won the election. It is clear to me that the Democrats are trying to influence the 2020 Presidential election at taxpayer expense.

Americans have real problems that we can and should be tackling instead. In May, the U.S. Border Patrol apprehended a jaw-dropping 133,000 people at our southern border. That is only the people they caught. Yet, we are here debating subpoenas targeting the President, probably because it will provide Democrats free airtime.

This unprecedented resolution should not even be on the House floor today. It has never been done before in the entire history of the United States.

The House has only sued for documents twice before. In both cases, the individuals in question were first found in contempt of Congress at both the committee level and by the full House. This has not happened here.

On top of that, the relevant subpoenas seek material that includes grand jury materials that, by law, cannot be made public. The Democrats are asking Attorney General Barr to violate the law.

When my colleagues and I tried to improve this resolution, the Democrats blocked us at every turn.

I offered an amendment that would let the American people know how much money this resolution would cost taxpayers. Democrats blocked it. Republicans offered amendments to prevent taxpayer money from going to lobbyists, to disclose contracts with lawyers, and to disclose where this taxpayer money was coming from to fund this witch hunt. Democrats blocked each and every one.

One amendment in particular highlights the partisan political, media-grabbing motives of this resolution. Republicans offered an amendment requiring the Judiciary Committee chairman to certify that he made a good faith effort to negotiate with the Attorney General, but the Democrats blocked that amendment, too.

The Attorney General has been transparent, and the Department of Justice has attempted numerous accommodations, including just yesterday when the Department of Justice agreed to let members of the committee view an unredacted report excluding grand jury material, which, by law, cannot be released.

□ 1430

But even as the Attorney General has attempted to work with the Committee on the Judiciary, Chairman NADLER has moved at unprecedented speed, moving from a demand for an unredacted report to subpoena to this resolution in a matter of mere weeks. From the Democrats' actions and prior statements, it is difficult not to view the purpose of this resolution and this debate as anything but political.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), the distinguished chairwoman of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN) for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H. Res. 430, which authorizes litigation to compel Attorney General Barr to provide key evidence underlying the Mueller report and the unredacted report itself, authorizes a civil suit to compel Don McGahn to provide the Committee on the Judiciary with documents and testimony, and, prospectively, allows committee chairs to bring civil actions on behalf of their committees to enforce their subpoenas without a subsequent full House vote when authorized by the bipartisan legal advisory group.

H. Res. 430 is key to ensuring that Congress is able to efficiently exercise its constitutional responsibilities in light of the unprecedented stonewalling by the Trump administration and a President who has openly said such things as: "We're fighting all the subpoenas," and, "I don't want people testifying."

Who does he think he is? A dictator?

The committees have requested information that we are constitutionally

entitled to, as a coequal branch of government, and that we need to fulfill our legislative and oversight responsibilities. In the Financial Services Committee, for example, we have subpoenaed documents from financial institutions, including Deutsche Bank and Capital One, as part of our investigation into the integrity of the United States financial system, bank safety and loan practices, and anti-money laundering policies, including as they apply to and involve the accounts of President Trump and family members. So, ladies and gentlemen, in another display of stonewalling, President Trump sued to prevent the banks from complying with the committee's valid subpoenas.

I will continue to support efforts to ensure that our critical oversight is not impeded.

Who does he think he is?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS), ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to H. Res. 430, a resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas, and for other purposes.

This resolution is an assault on this body's constitutional oversight authorities. By proceeding in this unprecedented manner, the House is putting the judicial branch in an unfortunate position.

Never before has the House authorized the general counsel to sue without first exhausting all our constitutional remedies to gain compliance with our oversight demands. Proceeding in this manner risks weakening our ability to carry out our oversight responsibilities.

On May 8, the Committee on the Judiciary voted 24-16 to hold Attorney General Barr in criminal contempt of Congress. The committee did not pursue contempt against Donald McGahn. Mr. McGahn's case is unique, and I will address it in more detail later.

Contrary to press reports, Mr. Speaker, we are not acting today on the contempt citation reported by the Committee on the Judiciary. We are authorizing the House to sue the Attorney General, Mr. McGahn, and any other official or private citizen any committee chair deems contemptuous in the future.

This is a novel, untested, and risky proposition. I will give it to you this way, Mr. Speaker: The majority is definitely audacious in their request.

The media and the Democrats routinely rail against the President being quick to sue. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what the majority is doing. Having rushed to contempt, we are now bypassing that remedy altogether and going straight to court.

Constitutional scholar Jonathan Turley recently wrote, Democrats' litigation strategy "is clearly driven more by political than legal calculations."

This is the problem I have, Mr. Speaker: These tactics weaken the House, aggrandize the executive branch, and cede decisionmaking to the judicial branch.

This is a problem. The majority can mess up oversight however they want to. The majority can rush to judgment whenever they want to.

My chairman has subpoenaed most everything that moves, and it seems other committees are wanting to as well. But here is the problem: When you are rushing to this and you are taking it on grounds that are not legally sound—and which, by the way, at this same hearing where Mr. Turley was, all three of the Democrat witnesses also agreed that the subpoena of the Attorney General was not legal in the sense that it was asking him to do something illegal.

The other issue here is, when you practice proper oversight, we are getting documents on election results, we are also getting documents on immigration and others from this administration. Where the rub has come is in overbroad illegal subpoenas from these committees.

Now, they may want to screw it up now for their purposes, but I don't want it in the future, going forward, where this House's oversight ability has been tampered by a rush to judgment. Let's think about this institution more than our next headline.

This is a problem because it is uncertain here, Mr. Speaker, the House will even be granted standing in court since we have declined to exercise all of our constitutional remedies, namely, contempt, in its many forms.

This is not the only impediment facing Democrats. At every turn, as we have discussed in our minority views to the committee's contempt report, the majority refused to engage with DOJ in the requisite negotiations and accommodation processes.

During our markup of the contempt resolution, the chairman made several damaging admissions—this is the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary:

First, he conceded the Attorney General cannot lawfully comply with his subpoena demanding grand jury material.

Second, he stated the subpoena was the beginning of a dialogue. I am not sure what first-year law student will believe that a subpoena is the beginning of a dialogue.

Third, he admitted the subpoena was intentionally broad to give the committee clout in court.

Again, I am not sure which Black's Law Dictionary we are looking up under "subpoena," but that is not part of it.

All along, the goal has been to get to court, not to get information and conduct legitimate oversight of Russian

interference or secure our elections. If Democrats were interested in these good government issues, they would have accepted DOJ's offer to review the nearly unredacted Mueller report.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the chairman, even, has not done so. The goal is to clearly haul the administration into court in an attempt to pacify a base rabid for impeachment.

When Congress exercises its oversight powers, it must take advantage of every offer of information from the other branch. It is disingenuous to decline the free information Democrats so strongly claim to want. It shows the majority does not want the information; they want a fight.

In addition to the subpoena being overly broad and requiring the Attorney General to violate the law to comply, the chairman failed to establish a valid legislative purpose for his demands. There are other avenues the chairman could seek to get the information he wants. Congress could pass a law granting itself an exemption to grand jury secrecy rules, but the majority has not brought that up.

The most alarming aspect of this action, however, is the unprecedented speed—a mere 44 days passed between the chairman's first request to the Attorney General and the date the committee held him in contempt. In stark contrast, 464 days passed from the date that Chairman Issa requested information from Attorney General Holder on Fast and Furious and the date the Committee on Oversight and Reform held him in contempt, 138 days for Harriet Miers and the date the committee held her in contempt.

The action the majority is authorizing today against Don McGahn, however, Mr. Speaker, is far more egregious for many reasons. Mr. McGahn is not the custodian of the documents the committee and the chairman demand. The White House is. Yet we are smearing a private citizen's reputation and dragging him into court—at taxpayer expense—in an effort to redo the Mueller investigation because the majority and the media didn't like the outcome.

Democrats again have failed to lay a foundation for any action against Mr. McGahn. Chairman NADLER has never formally objected to the President's protective assertion of executive privilege or other common law privileges asserted by Mr. McGahn.

Under Supreme Court precedent, the chairman must take this important procedural step to pursue further actions against a witness. The witness should be given a clear-cut choice between compliance and noncompliance, between answering the question and risking prosecution for contempt. Here, the witness is being hauled into court without proper notice.

Evidence of this glaring error is in the RECORD. On May 31, Chairman NADLER wrote Mr. McGahn's counsel and stated he did not agree with the White House or Mr. McGahn and offered to

continue negotiating, but the chairman also gave Mr. McGahn a deadline of June 7—this past Friday—to respond. Meanwhile, the Rules Committee noticed a markup of this resolution on June 6, one day before the deadline.

I think we are seeing the pattern here. This is a revealing error. But errors occur when you are pushing action through at light speed and ceding your power to the judicial branch. A court will decide whether the House has standing, whether the case is right, and whether the Congress is entitled to the information outside of an impeachment inquiry.

As also has been said, the propositions are a gamble. Here, Mr. Speaker, we are gambling with the power of a coequal branch. This approach is untested and can do significant harm to Congress' Article I authority.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I must make mention, the authorization of the general counsel to seek pro bono legal services circumvents the House ethics rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, those rules provide an exception for Members to bring civil action challenging the lawfulness of an action of a Federal agency or an action of a Federal official taken in an official capacity provided that the action concerns a matter of public interest rather than a matter that is personal in nature.

This resolution contravenes ethics rules by giving the general counsel the authority, in Mr. McGahn's case, to solicit a gift: pro bono level services. I am not sure that was the majority's intent, but the inconsistencies result when Democrats aim to rush resolutions through the House outside of regular order.

Mr. Speaker, the majority may wish to change the rules. This majority may wish to get to the finish line quicker. The majority may wish to circumvent everything that is present in this House—and we have seen a lot of it over the past 5½ months—but I wish they would take into account that they may not be the majority forever, hopefully, and if they mess up oversight of a coequal branch, it is on their hands.

That is what the vote for "yes" is on this resolution. That is why a Member of this body should vote "no" for the integrity of this House.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just assure the gentleman from Georgia that there is nothing novel about this legislation. It is not novel because everything in this bill goes to the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, and that has been the case in the past.

What is novel, however, is a President of the United States who says "ignore subpoenas" and "we will not cooperate" and tells people not to testify. That is not only novel, it is shocking.

Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my friends on the other side: You are going

to have a choice today to either vote for this resolution and stand up for this institution and support the rule of law, or you are going to vote in a way that is going to be complicit with this President's obstruction and disrespect for this institution and disrespect for the rule of law. I urge you to vote with us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, the Trump administration is engaged in one of the most unprecedented coverups since Watergate, and it is not just about Russia. It is so much broader than that. This coverup spans across numerous investigations, and it extends from the White House to multiple Federal agencies of government to completely separate outside parties.

The administration officials now question the fundamental basis of Congress to conduct oversight. They object to committee rules and precedence that have been in place for decades under both Republican and Democratic leaders, and they make baseless legal arguments to avoid producing documents and testimony. The Trump administration is challenging the very constitutionality of congressional oversight, and it is happening in broad daylight.

Several weeks ago, President Trump vowed, "We're fighting all the subpoenas." Since then, he has refused to work on legislative priorities such as infrastructure until Congress halts oversight and investigations of his administration. He wants us to forgo our responsibility under the Constitution as a condition of passing laws to help our constituents and his constituents.

The President's arguments are baseless. He suggests that all subpoenas that Congress puts out are partisan and somehow related to the Russia probe, but that is simply not correct. In the Oversight and Reform Committee, we have issued eight subpoenas: six of them are bipartisan and none of them are about Russia. They involve issues like the census, immigrant children being locked in cages and separated from their families, and the President's finances.

□ 1445

This entire year, the White House has not produced one document to the Oversight and Reform Committee. Let me say that again: In all of our investigations, the White House has not produced one single shred of paper in response to our requests.

The hurricanes in Puerto Rico, the White House has produced nothing. Security clearance abuses, the White

House has produced nothing. Efforts to transfer nuclear technology to Saudi Arabia, the White House has produced nothing. Hush-money payments, the White House has produced not a thing. Even on issues like spending taxpayer dollars to pay for private jets, the White House has produced absolutely nothing.

Over and over again, it does not matter what the topic is, the tactics are the same. This begs the question: What are we covering up?

Tomorrow, our committee will vote on whether to hold the Attorney General and the Secretary of Commerce in contempt of Congress for refusing to produce documents relating to the Census. Again, these subpoenas are bipartisan, and this issue has nothing to do with Russia. Yet, the Trump administration has delayed, stonewalled, obstructed, and challenged the authority of the Congress on even those questions.

I support today's resolution because it makes clear that in addition to seeking criminal contempt on the House floor, committees may seek authority to enforce their subpoenas directly in civil court actions. Nobody is above the law.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, nobody is above the law, not even the President of the United States.

Today's resolution reaffirms that Congress has the independent authority under the Constitution to investigate waste, fraud, abuse, and wrongdoing so that we can pass laws that are effective and efficient on behalf of all of our constituents.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Before proceeding, Members are again reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS), my friend.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. I oppose this resolution.

The subpoena for Attorney General Barr is unenforceable on its face. It demands the full and unredacted Mueller report, including grand jury material that the Attorney General cannot lawfully disclose, and the Democrats know this.

In a hearing last month, Chairman NADLER admitted that Attorney General Barr could not lawfully release grand jury material. He therefore admitted that the Attorney General could not lawfully comply with the subpoena.

Instead, the chairman suggested that the subpoena is a starting point in negotiations. Rarely have I heard that term used with regard to a subpoena. In fact, I never heard it before that time.

In the Judiciary Committee's hearing on executive privilege last month, one of the majority's own witnesses testified that "one of the categories of information presently sought by the committee appears so broad as to put the executive branch officials to a nearly impossible task. . . . The committee cannot in good faith expect compliance; accordingly, the burden is on the committee to substantially narrow this aspect of its request."

My friends talk about the rule of law, but the Democrats have admitted in a hearing in the Judiciary Committee that the subpoena was overly broad and that objects of the subpoena that are prohibited from disclosure, such as 6(e) material, were not subject to the subpoena. But they didn't fix their subpoena. They didn't issue a new subpoena. They didn't amend the subpoena. They just attempted to amend their contempt citation.

The defendant's confusion over what is subject to a subpoena is adequate evidence that the subpoena itself is legally deficient as being confusing and overly broad. A court will not be able to read the collective minds of our Democratic colleagues and will not expect such clairvoyance from the Attorney General nor from the former White House Counsel.

The administration is currently negotiating in good faith. We see that an agreement was reached just yesterday. The same Democrat, when discussing the assertion of executive privilege by the administration, stated, "These developments do not, however, relieve the committee of its obligation to continue to negotiate."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, just as the subpoena is overly broad and, quite frankly, unprecedented, as well as legally deficient, this resolution is also overly broad and unique in the annals of American history.

When the chairwoman from California referred to the President of the United States as a dictator, her language was rancorous and unparliamentary, but it seems to have been filled with projection, as this resolution provides unique authorities.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished Speaker of the House.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for giving us this opportunity to protect and defend the Constitution of the United States, which is our oath of office.

Let me salute the chairs of the committees of jurisdiction who have led us down this path of great respect for law, precedent, and the oath we take: Congresswoman MAXINE WATERS, Congressman CUMMINGS, Congressman NADLER,

Congressman RICHARD NEAL, and Congressman ELIOT ENGEL, all of whom have been fighting the fight and gathering the facts to protect and defend our Constitution.

The oath of office that we take is why we are on the floor today, to hold Attorney General of the United States Barr and former White House Counsel McGahn in civil contempt for their refusal to comply with Congress' subpoenas. We must follow the facts and uncover the truth for the American people.

At the birth of our democracy, amid war and revolution, Thomas Paine said the times have found us. We are here today because the times have found us. While we do not place ourselves in the same category of greatness as our Founders, we do recognize the urgency of the threat to our Nation that we face today.

This body has a solemn duty, Mr. Speaker, to protect and defend our democracy, honoring the oath we take and the Constitution that is the foundation of our freedom. That Constitution begins with our beautiful preamble, "We the People."

Immediately following those words of the preamble is Article I, establishing a Congress in which "all legislative Powers herein granted are vested."

The Founders conferred upon the first branch responsibilities that are sweeping in scope. We set an agenda. We hold the power of the purse. We write the laws that all of us are bound by, including the President of the United States and those who surround him.

Fundamental to those responsibilities is oversight of the executive branch and all the areas essential to the well-being of the American people.

Oversight is our institutional duty, to ensure against the abuse of power, protect the rule of law, and expose the truth for the people who are "the only legitimate fountain of power," in the words of James Madison.

To conduct that oversight, the Congress is both constitutionally obligated and legally entitled to access and review materials from the executive branch, which it can subpoena.

Yet, the President and the administration have shown an unprecedented and unjustifiable refusal to furnish Congress with that information. President Trump himself has said, "We're fighting all the subpoenas," and, "I don't want people testifying," and, "No do-overs."

His administration has employed every tool it can find to obstruct legitimate committee oversight, everything from witness intimidation to blanket stonewalling to spurious claims of executive privilege, absolute immunity, and lack of legislative purpose.

This obstruction violates decades of established legal precedent. Throughout our history, the courts have made absolutely clear that the House has the authority to follow the facts to uncover the truth for the American people

and that "the power of the Congress to conduct investigations is inherent in the legislative process."

Our oversight responsibility continues to be resoundingly affirmed in the courts again and again. Last month, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia ruled in the Mazars court decision that "there can be little doubt that Congress' interest in the accuracy of the President's financial disclosures falls within the legislative sphere."

That same week, the judge ruled in the Deutsche Bank case that Congress' "subpoenas are all in service of facially legitimate investigative purposes."

The administration's obstruction not only violates long-established precedent, but it also endangers our very democracy. We need answers on the many questions left unanswered by the Mueller report, which made clear that the Russians waged an all-out attack on our democracy, and the Mueller report documented 11 instances of obstruction from the White House itself.

This is a grave threat to our democracy, but the President calls it a "hoax" and refuses to protect our democracy. Why is that? We take an oath to protect our Constitution from all enemies, foreign and domestic. What the White House and the administration are doing is a danger and a threat to our democracy.

At the same time, the administration's campaign of stonewalling extends far beyond the Mueller report. The administration is obscuring the truth behind its disastrous policy decisions, from attacking Affordable Care Act coverage for millions of Americans, including those with preexisting conditions, taking it to court to overturn it while saying to the American people that it supports preexisting conditions coverage; to tearing apart vulnerable immigrant families at the border; to stealing military funds for an ineffective, wasteful border wall; to rolling back key civil rights protections for women, LGBTQ Americans, and people of color. The list goes on and on.

In court, they also tried to defend their abuse of power when it comes to the Census, which the Constitution is very clear about, that every 10 years the people of the country will be enumerated. They want to put a citizenship phrase in there to put a chilling effect on our getting an accurate count.

The well-being of the American people and the integrity of our democracy are imperiled by this brazen behavior. Senator MCCONNELL declares "case closed," enabling this campaign of blanket, unprecedented obstruction.

We see the obstruction in this House to trying to uphold our proceedings, but we have the votes to proceed. The United States Senate has a responsibility to protect and defend the Constitution, but they are ignoring that. As Members of Congress, we have a responsibility to honor our oath of office

and strengthen the institution in which we serve for the people.

We have a responsibility under the vision of our Founders and the text of the Constitution to ensure that the truth is known. No one is above the law. Everyone will be held accountable, including the President of the United States.

The people's House will continue to fight to make the truth known for the American people and will defend Congress' role under Article I.

I urge a strong bipartisan vote for this resolution to hold Attorney General Barr and former White House Counsel McGahn in civil contempt for their refusal to comply with Congress' subpoenas and to honor the oath of office that they take.

I urge an "aye" vote.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, there is a reason for the abusive rhetoric from the left. For 2½ years, they peddled a monstrous lie that Donald Trump is colluding with a hostile foreign government. They concocted it with a phony dossier commissioned by the Clinton campaign and promoted by the highest officials in the FBI, our intelligence agencies, and the Justice Department, first in a failed attempt to interfere with the 2016 Presidential election and then to undermine the constitutionally elected President of the United States.

Now, despite spending \$25 million on an outrageously biased team of partisan zealots assembled by Mr. Mueller, which initially included the now-infamous Peter Strzok and Lisa Page, and using some of the most abusive prosecutorial tactics ever employed in this country, they could find no evidence to support the lie.

□ 1500

So what to do?

They had to think up another lie and think it up quick. So now we hear cries of obstruction and coverup. Good luck with that.

Coverup of a crime that never happened?

Obstruction, by turning over every document Mueller requested and even waiving executive privilege to allow the White House counsel to testify?

Now, Mr. Speaker, you compare that to Hillary Clinton's willful destruction of 30,000 emails under subpoena and you get a sense of the double standard involved here.

This is a desperate scavenger hunt to salvage their false narrative, and their time and the Nation's patience is running out. The other shoe is about to drop. Broad investigations are now well underway and will soon reveal how this lie was perpetrated and promoted. Two governments interfered in our elections, the Russians through ham-handed propaganda, and the Obama administration by turning the most terrifying powers entrusted to our government against our political process.

The reckoning is coming. As Longfellow said:

The wheels of the gods grind slow, but they grind exceedingly fine.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN).

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, this is an opportunity for Congress to reassert itself as an equal branch of government. The fact that it is supposed to be three equal branches of government is not totally accurate.

When we came up with the Constitution, we decided that we didn't want to have an autocratic king rule us. That is why we had a revolution. When the men met to write our Constitution, they made Congress Article I. There was a reason they made Congress Article I, because the Congress represents the people. It is not a king, it is not an autocrat, and it is not a despot. It is the Representatives of the people who make the laws. We are supposed to really be the embodiment—and we are the embodiment—of the American people.

This President has thumbed his nose at the Representatives of the people by not complying with lawful requests for documentation and lawful requests for testimony for Congress to do its constitutionally delegated purpose of oversight of the executive branch and laws that are necessary for the betterment of this Nation.

This is about time Congress did act. I am proud of Congress for bringing these bills, and I am shocked at the opposition for not wanting the people's House—their House, their legislative body—to stand up for future Congresses as well as this Congress for the rightful power that it deserves to do oversight and perform its functions with the best possible witnesses and testimony and materials that could aid it in its efforts.

I support the contempt citations. I condemn the parties that have thumbed their noses at us, subpoena under law, they are supposed to arrive with documentation and appear to testify. If they object, they can object there and then, not just disregard Congresses' subpoenas that are lawful.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend on the Rules Committee for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I have been listening to the debate intently. I don't disagree with much of what my friend from Tennessee had to say. It is a bad habit that both parties have gotten into over the decades of my lifetime putting party above Article in terms of judicial oversight, executive branch oversight, and even our responsibilities here, such as declaring war.

But what you have not heard here today, Mr. Speaker, and what you will not hear is why the passage of this resolution advantages us in any way. There is not one piece of information

that the Speaker of our House—our Speaker—just came and asked for that we are not empowered to request today.

The difference, Mr. Speaker, is if we pass this resolution, rather than the House requesting this information—as has historically been true—we would begin to request information one committee chairman at a time.

Does that advantage us in Article I, going to court one committee chairman at a time, or are we advantaged when the Speaker speaks on behalf of us all?

I don't know the answer, Mr. Speaker. I am not a legal scholar, and in the Rules Committee where we had original jurisdiction on this, we did not call any legal scholars to help us answer that question. In the Judiciary Committee they did not call any legal scholars to help to answer this question.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you there is not a Member of this institution on either side of the aisle who cares more about Article I and our exerting the responsibilities the Constitution gives to us and our constituents expect us to do than I do. Perhaps there is someone in here who cares as much, but there is no one who cares more.

Are we disadvantaging the institution for life by taking what has traditionally been the responsibility of our Speaker to do on behalf of all of us and putting it in the hands of committee chairmen?

We don't know, and anyone who tells you that they do isn't telling you the truth. We are going to continue to argue about the White House and what they have turned over and what they ought to turn over, Mr. Speaker. That is not what this bill does today. There is not one piece of information that is requested that we do not have the authority to request today. Let's not move in ways that disadvantage us for generations to come.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who is the majority leader.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to follow the gentleman from Georgia.

I have a card in my hand. This is a Member's identification. There is no designation of party on this card. This card designates 435 of us when we are at full complement as Members of the Congress, the people's Representatives. I urge all my colleagues to use this card in a few minutes on behalf of the people and on behalf of this institution.

Mr. Speaker, when Democrats won the majority in this House, we did so on a promise to the American people to hold the executive department accountable. That is our responsibility. The Constitution gives us that responsibility, and we swear an oath to uphold the Constitution. That is what the committees have been doing, and it is what the whole House is doing today.

Now, the previous speaker said we have the right to ask for any information. That is accurate. What he did not then say is we have asked, and we have been refused. Not only have we been refused in the particular, we have been refused in the general because the President of the United States has directed his people not to give us any information and not to respond to any subpoenas, whatever the rationale may be.

Why?

Because he believes the House of Representatives is not acting properly.

Mr. Speaker, you imagine anybody who doesn't want to give us information would say, I am not going to give it to you because you are not asking properly?

Of course, that is what they do; and the House, on behalf of the American people, would be unable to perform its constitutional duty. This is not political. It is constitutional. It is about separation of powers. It is about responsibility. It is about accountability.

The House is exercising its responsibility to uncover all the facts and discover the truth on behalf of the American people. We represent, each us, about 750,000 people. We are not asking on our own behalf. We are asking for the people, so that the people have the information they need in a democracy to make the decisions that they are called upon to make in a very solemn exercise we call voting.

Attorney General Barr and former White House Counsel McGahn have both refused to respond to subpoenas to testify before the House, and the Attorney General refuses to allow Congress to see the full and unredacted report by the special counsel, Mr. Mueller. You can see entire pages blacked out, Mr. Speaker.

The Attorney General's efforts to prejudice the conclusions of that report before it is released, as he did, and his public mischaracterization of its conclusions are, in my opinion, evidence of the contempt with which he refuses to answer questions and respond to subpoenas. It seems contemptuous as well of the basic principles of the rule of law and checks and balances.

The American people deserve to know the full extent of Russia's efforts to interfere in our elections and subvert our democracy.

Mr. Speaker, you didn't have to listen too closely to Bob Mueller to understand that he believed that there was much more to be found or to miss the fact that he said to Congress: Do your duty and make sure the American people know the facts.

The American people deserve to know whether the President or anyone in his administration or inner circle of confidants were involved and tried to cover it up.

Now we have been accused of doing awful things, but I remember watching conventions where they said, "lock her up, lock her up." Flynn—General Flynn—who was the National Security Advisor said: "Lock her up."

Well, the fact is they locked him up, and many others who were associated who lied about their involvement with the Russian Government and, yes, with other foreign countries. So there is reason for the Congress to want to get to the bottom of this serious invasion of our election process.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to stand up for our Constitution and vote for this resolution. I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank Chairman NADLER, Chairman SCHIFF, Chairman CUMMINGS, Chairman NEAL, Chairman ENGEL, and Chairwoman WATERS, all who have jurisdiction over various facets of the information that is needed, and I thank the members of their committees for their hard work to conduct necessary oversight on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, that is what this vote is about. I presented that card. It has no party designation on it. It just has a designation of us—each of us—as Representatives of the people. Let us make sure that today we vote for the people and stand up for our Constitution, for this House, and for the rule of law.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), who is my fellow Judiciary Committee member.

Mr. CHABOT. I thank the gentleman for yielding, Mr. Speaker, and I rise in opposition to this resolution.

It seems to allow Democrats on the Judiciary Committee to go to essentially whatever court they want to get a court order to get whatever documents they want—even grand jury documents and those that relate to our national security—all because they don't want, or are afraid to, really, hold Attorney General Barr or former White House Counsel Don McGahn in contempt of Congress, just as they are afraid to institute impeachment proceedings against President Trump or accept the fact that the Mueller investigation found that there was no collusion and Attorney General Barr found no obstruction.

They just can't get it through their heads that that is the case, and they don't want to focus on the real issue threatening our democracy which is that Russia actually attempted to interfere in our national elections back in 2016 while Barack Obama—not Donald Trump—was President, and the Obama administration did absolutely nothing about that.

They really don't seem too concerned that the Russians or another foreign entity might attempt to do so again in 2020. That is what they ought to be using their oversight powers—very powerful things the power that the majority has—they ought to be using it about that, not this charade.

□ 1515

How many documents have the Democrats requested that relate to Russian interference in our elections? None. How many hearings? Zip. How

many Obama-administration officials and others connected to Russia's efforts have they subpoenaed to testify before the Judiciary Committee? Zero.

By continuing with this fake impeachment, the Democrats are doing the American public a disservice. My Democratic colleagues ought to be embarrassed.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me correct the RECORD in response to the gentleman from Ohio. The Russians didn't attempt to interfere in our election; they did interfere in our election.

And, if my friends read the Mueller report, they would realize they interfered in the election to help Donald Trump get elected.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the distinguished chair of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, when a congressional committee issues a subpoena, compliance is not optional. We expect witnesses to testify when summoned. We expect the administration to comply with subpoenas and to provide us with the materials we require to do our jobs.

Of course, there may be differences between the Congress and the executive branch as to what information can be produced on a timely basis. When those differences arise, we are required to seek a reasonable accommodation.

We first requested access to the full Mueller report and the underlying evidence on February 22. After refusing for almost 4 months, the Department of Justice, in the last few days, has finally agreed to permit us to view the special counsel's most important files.

We are hopeful this will provide us with key evidence regarding allegations of obstruction of justice and other misconduct.

Given this potential breakthrough, we will hold the criminal contempt process for Attorney General Barr in abeyance for now.

But President Trump has blocked other key witnesses from testifying before the Judiciary Committee, including his former White House counsel Don McGahn, whose account of the President's actions was featured in the Mueller report.

The President has claimed absolute immunity for critical witnesses to prevent them from even showing up. He has invoked executive privilege to prevent us from seeing documents that stopped being privileged long ago, if they were ever privileged to begin with.

He has done the same in response to Congress' important work unrelated to the Mueller report, and he has ordered the agencies not to cooperate with even our most basic oversight requests.

This unprecedented stonewalling by the administration is completely unacceptable. The committees have a constitutional responsibility to conduct oversight, to make recommendations to the House as necessary, and to craft

legislation that will curb the abuse of power on full display in the Trump administration.

This is why it is important that the Judiciary Committee be able to act in such matters using all of our Article I powers, as contemplated in this resolution and described in both the Rules Committee report and the House Judiciary Committee's contempt report.

Now, I heard what the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) said a few minutes ago, and he is exactly right. This resolution gives committee chairs the power, with the approval of the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, to go to court on behalf of the House to enforce our subpoenas.

This has not been done before, but neither have we ever seen blanket stonewalling by the administration of all information requests by the House. We have never faced such blanket stonewalling.

The President himself said—and they have been as good as their word—they will oppose all of our subpoenas.

We must go to court to enforce the subpoenas without a separate floor vote each time if we are going to enforce our subpoenas and reject the arrogant assumption of power by the administration and denigration of the power of the House and of the Congress.

We cannot afford to waste all the floor time every single time the administration rejects one of our subpoenas, which is every time we issue a subpoena.

That is why we must pass this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution so that we can get into court and break the stonewall without delay.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), our Republican leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, Special Counsel Mueller officially ended his investigation several weeks ago. His office is closed. Because of Attorney General Barr, his report is public.

And his findings are very clear: No collusion and no obstruction. This is the bottom line of the Mueller report.

But, Mr. Speaker, Democrats refuse to accept it. Mr. Speaker, even the chairman of the committee refuses to go read the portion that he is allowed to read, only six lines. He refuses to read it, but he wants to come here today.

They continue to believe their worst conspiracy theories about the President, despite all the evidence to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, it is even reported in newspapers that, in the campaign to become chairman of the Judiciary Committee, one said he campaigned for the position because he would be the best with impeachment.

Mr. Speaker, even on the floor of this House, there were more than 60 Mem-

bers on the other side of the aisle who voted for impeachment before the Mueller report was ever presented to the public.

At its core, H. Res. 430 is just a desperate attempt to relitigate the Mueller investigation. That is why I urge my colleagues to oppose this resolution.

It does not strengthen Congress' oversight powers, contrary to what you may hear from the other side, Mr. Speaker. Fundamentally, it is an impeachment effort in everything but name.

Mr. Speaker, just look at the unnecessary contempt citation against Attorney General Barr. Less than a month after Barr received the Mueller report, Mr. Speaker, Chairman NADLER issued a subpoena that would have required the Attorney General of the United States of America to break the law.

That is not my opinion. Let's be very clear whose words those are: Jonathan Turley's. Mr. Speaker, probably everybody in this body not only knows who Jonathan Turley is; he has, probably, the utmost respect. He is one of the most respected legal scholars in this country.

Now, he told the committee, Mr. Speaker:

You have to tie your request carefully to your authority to demand information . . . if Bill Barr had actually complied with the subpoena as written, he would have violated Federal law.

If he would have complied, he would have violated Federal law.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we are here. Not only, Mr. Speaker, does the chairman of that committee ask the attorney general to break the law or he will try to hold him in contempt; he won't even go read the report.

On May 8, only a few weeks after the first subpoena was issued, House Judiciary Democrats voted to hold A. G. Barr, the Attorney General of the United States, in contempt.

Why would they vote to hold him in contempt? Because they were so angry that the Attorney General wouldn't break the law. They wanted him to break the law; then he won't be held in contempt.

In a May 24 letter to the Attorney General, Chairman NADLER offered, for the first time, to negotiate and narrow the scope of his subpoena request. Then, you know what? He changed his mind.

Yesterday, the Department of Justice reached an agreement with the Judiciary Committee to turn over documents related to the Mueller report.

Now, if the public is watching, this just looks so disorganized. You wonder, from that committee, Mr. Speaker, wouldn't they know better than to ask the Attorney General to break the law?

Mr. Speaker, wouldn't you know that, when you get to this point in a career, you wouldn't be so upset that someone just doesn't do exactly what you want—and you ask them to break

the law—that you would vote to hold them in contempt and force your side of the aisle just to vote that way.

That is not how it has happened in this body before. If the public wants to see a good example of congressional oversight, then let's look at something that is comparable: the House's contempt vote against Attorney General Holder in 2012.

The House Committee on Oversight and Reform took two important actions before suing in Federal court. First, it negotiated with Attorney General Holder in good faith for 15 months—not a few days. It never asked him to break the law either.

After narrowing the scope of its original subpoena, and only after extensive back-and-forth negotiations failed, did it vote to hold him in contempt.

Second, it got the full House to vote on it and approve—you know what—a bipartisan contempt.

Now, I am not sure why the Committee on the Judiciary, Mr. Speaker, would not know this, but I did a little research because I was here during that time. You know why they didn't realize it was the best way to do it and it was bipartisan? Because, Mr. Speaker, a lot of them stormed outside of the Chamber.

Yep. You heard me right. Even though 17 Democrats voted in favor of the criminal contempt resolution against Holder and 21 voted to enforce civil citation, a number of them stormed outside and protested, took their ball and ran home. Mr. Speaker, I guess, to the public, it looked like they had just thrown another fit.

Now, that is pretty significant. As many of you remember, it was contentious. I remember, Mr. Speaker, watching then-Minority Leader PELOSI, Minority Whip HOYER, and Congressman NADLER lead 100 Democrats off the House floor to protest the vote.

Mr. Speaker, you won't see that on our side. We believe in the rule of law. Mr. Speaker, we would have done the exact same thing the Attorney General did, that Jonathan Turley said, that you would have had to break the law to try to appease somebody's own personal vendetta.

The idea, Mr. Speaker, that someone would run for a position to say that they would be best to impeach somebody and even vote to impeach without even having a report and then, when you get a report and you could go down and read just those six lines that you want to complain about, but you won't—the same person, Mr. Speaker, that would run outside and say: I got elected to Congress, but I am going to pout and I am going to go outside.

Mr. Speaker, that may be the same person that would want to bring this to the floor today.

But what is so different about today than all the others? Well, we are doing something we have never done before. We are doing something that is going to take the power away of every Member in this body and give it to a select few.

Mr. Speaker, if this vote passes today, Members of this body are going to say: Don't bring it here and let me represent my own people and vote about going to court. Let's just give it, really, to three people. Let's give it to Speaker NANCY PELOSI, Majority Leader HOYER, and to the majority whip. Because that is what BLAG is.

I know the courts are going to sit there and say that is not what Congress is supposed to do. Congress has never done that before. But, you know what? If this new majority thinks all they want to do is make an attorney general break the law, I guess they could break every rule, every history, every point of representation there is inside this body.

Did we wonder if this would happen? Do we wonder why you wouldn't take the months, as they have shown in the time before, and actually come to a bipartisan conclusion?

I think the plan was already written. I don't know if people can talk about the word "patient" because, Mr. Speaker, I remember Congressman HANK JOHNSON of the Rules Committee—this is the Speaker's committee, so everybody understands correctly, that is just appointed by the Speaker on the majority side—said, Mr. Speaker: "Donald Trump will stand for reelection again in a very short period of time, and we don't have 400 days to wait. . . ."

So, don't care about the rule of law. Don't care about asking him to break the law. Just break every historical trend and try to take the power away from millions of Americans and from the Members of Congress who represent them here.

I didn't know today would come. Mr. Speaker, I didn't know if someone would go this far.

I didn't know, just because someone, Mr. Speaker, despises somebody else, that an election didn't turn out the way of the desire—Mr. Speaker, I have been on losing sides before, but I would never think I would break the law just because of losing an election.

I would never think of asking somebody in as high an office as the Attorney General of the United States of America to not give due process, to come to the floor and strip the power of 430 Members and put it in a select few.

Mr. Speaker, I have to be honest. I don't put anything past what this new desire is about.

□ 1530

Mr. Speaker, Democrats say we are in a constitutional crisis, and they are right, but not because of Attorney General Barr. The constitutional crisis is this: When Democrats can't win, they change the rules.

I just heard it on the floor, Mr. Speaker, that, yes, from the other side of the aisle, said this has never been done before, and, yes, this is nothing this House has ever desired to do. But it is also no way to govern.

The American people deserve a majority that is serious about coming up with solutions, not subpoenas. There are plenty of important challenges that we can be working on to solve.

Just yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I opened *The New York Times*. It is not a paper that I think I always agree with, but it had an editorial not for the first time, but for the second time, and it was talking about the crisis on the border.

As I read this editorial, I found myself agreeing with it greatly. When I read it, it talked about the border, talked about Washington needing to stop dithering and do something about it.

I looked and wondered what committee would be most responsible for this challenge? Lo and behold, it was the Judiciary. So I turned it on in hopes that I would see a hearing, maybe I would even see a markup.

No, Mr. Speaker, who did I see? I saw John Dean. John Dean, who pleaded guilty in Watergate. The same individual who has put more than 900 tweets out against the President, many before any Mueller report came forth. He was the expert witness—the same individual who is paid by CNN, the same individual who said the Presidency of George Bush was worse than Watergate.

I guess this new majority will go to no end. It doesn't matter if the facts don't go where they want; just change the rules.

I wonder, all these new freshman Democrats, Mr. Speaker, when they swore in to uphold the Constitution, does that mean trying to make the Attorney General break the law? Does that mean giving their power away to a select few?

There is a crisis on the border. The *New York Times* knows it. The country of Mexico knows it. I think almost everybody in America knows it except, Mr. Speaker, I guess, this majority.

The committee of responsibility is more concerned about bringing somebody in who pleaded guilty in Watergate, who makes their money off, Mr. Speaker, writing books claiming every Republican President there is is worse than Watergate and then asking the Attorney General to break the law.

That is not a legacy I would be proud of. It is not a legacy I would want to be a part of.

But, Mr. Speaker, I will say on this floor: I will vote against taking the power away, even the power away from people on the other side of the aisle. I won't lead a protest, and I won't go outside, and I won't take my ball, and I won't run home. I believe in the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I had the responsibility and the opportunity to go read the redacted portions of the Mueller report, just as some on the other side of the aisle could. It is just six lines. Not that I think it was just my responsibility, but as an elected official I thought it was a responsibility, so I went. But,

Mr. Speaker, the people leading this today, they have not. They think they know better.

I don't know if they know better, but one thing I do know: They are changing the rules of the House simply because they cannot win. That is not the American way.

Those are the reasons why we stand up. Those are the things that America unites behind, the rule of law. This will not be a day that is proud. This will not be a day that, when they look back in history, the individuals who vote for this will talk about.

It is one when they get asked the question later in life, Mr. Speaker, is there something they regret, they will regret that emotion overtook them. They will regret their own personal dislike drove them.

I am not sure if they are proud of the day when they storm out of the building, even though there is a bipartisan vote here. But I guess that same emotion, the same, Mr. Speaker, lack of ability to actually look at the rule of law and work toward something instead of just changing the rules because you can't have your way, that is what today is about.

The worst part of it all is removing the power of individual Members and putting in a select three. But then again, Mr. Speaker, when you study history and forms of government, that is what socialism is all about.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The distinguished minority leader began by saying that the Mueller report makes it clear that there was no collusion and no obstruction. Maybe that is what you would conclude if you just read Barr's summary which tried to cover up what the Mueller report said, but I would urge the distinguished minority leader to read the report. I am happy to lend him my bifocals if he has trouble reading it.

But the report doesn't say that. It doesn't say no collusion. And on the issue of obstruction of justice, it says: If we were convinced that he, the President, did not commit a crime, we would have said so.

That is what the report says. And I would remind my colleagues that obstruction of justice is a crime.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU).

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, the issue today is very simple. It is simply about the right of the American people and Congress to get information. That is it.

All this resolution does is allow us to enforce congressional subpoenas. These are documents and witnesses we want, and it allows us to go to Federal court to enforce it. That is all this resolution does.

Why are Republicans so scared of this resolution? Because they know we are going to win in court. We have won three times against the Trump administration.

But why do we even have to go to court to do this? Because the Trump administration is engaging in unprecedented obstruction. And it is not just about the Mueller report; it is about all areas.

So, for example, right now, the Trump administration is suing to eliminate healthcare coverage for people with preexisting conditions. We want to know more about that. We can't get it. We want to know about a lot of areas that we cannot get, so we want to go to Federal court to get this enforced.

What are Republicans doing? They are making stuff up. They are saying somehow we are asking the Attorney General to do things that will make him violate the law. That is wrong, wrong, wrong.

I am just going to end with this simple example.

The Attorney General of the United States gave the Republican ranking member of the Judiciary Committee the right to see their unredacted Mueller report. Was that illegal? No. But I can't see it.

That is wrong. There is no basis for that. We are simply going to go to Federal court. We are going to litigate it, and we are going to win.

All this resolution does is it allows us to enforce congressional subpoenas in Federal court. It is about not allowing the Trump administration to cover things up.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this is about harassing the President, and it is about delaying the inevitable.

I would have hoped that my friends across the aisle, especially in the Judiciary Committee that had concerns in 2005 and 2006 about the overreach that was possible through the FISA procedures, would have seen that there was no collusion, that the Russians did try, but nobody with the Trump campaign bought.

So we are left with the fact that the real collusion here was between the Clinton campaign, with Fusion GPS hiring a foreign agent, Christopher Steele, who talked to people he now admits could well have been agents of Vladimir Putin, who gave false information about Trump, the candidate, that was used in a dossier that was used to manipulate the FISA court into giving a warrant to start spying on the Trump campaign. That is what this was about.

And what people are calling obstruction of justice is exactly what you have when you have somebody falsely accused of colluding, conspiring with the Russians, and he knows he didn't do that, and he sees his family being harassed, and everybody that worked with the campaign that can be pushed and shoved and blackmailed, as happened, and bankrupted, you want to bring it to an end. You want to see justice done.

But instead of my friends in Judiciary coming together with us who have been concerned about the abuses of the FISA system so that it doesn't happen to other Americans, instead, they come with this resolution to push the matter down the road a little further to the 2020 election.

It has got to stop. Let's stop now.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate to correct a number of statements that have been made on the floor.

First of all, this is not the end. Director Mueller made this the beginning. When he concluded the report, he left a very large direction to the United States Congress. He recognized that he could not follow up because of policies at the DOJ regarding indictment in the process of the administration.

So the Congress, in its due diligence, took the responsibility not to target anyone, but to simply uphold the rule of law. In upholding the rule of law, we had an empty seat by Attorney General Barr, an empty seat by Mr. McGahn, an empty seat by Ms. Hicks, Ms. Donaldson, and we hope not an empty seat of the author of the report.

So all this resolution does is authorize the committee to seek civil enforcement of its subpoenas against Attorney General Barr, requiring him to provide Congress with the key evidence underlying the Mueller report as well as the unredacted report itself, and former White House Counsel Donald F. McGahn, requiring him to provide documents and appear for testimony.

He is not covered by executive privilege. In fact, executive privilege does not cover—his duty is to the White House Office of the General Counsel, or the White House counsel's office, not to the individual officeholder, the President. He has personal lawyers.

And we didn't break the law. 6(e), which is grand jury materials, our committee diligently said let's work with the Department of Justice, go to court, and decide what we can see.

We are simply following this little book that many have died for, and that is the Constitution of the United States, and those words in the Declaration of Independence that said we all are created equal, with certain unalienable rights of life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. The American people would not want a Congress that turned its back on, frankly, the rule of law.

For those of us who had the special privilege of going to Normandy this past week, we got a great sense of pride, of the courage of Americans, the bravery of those young men, and all I could think of is how important it is to

all of us to adhere to those wonderful principles.

So, again, there is no targeting here. This is not a way to do policy or legislation. We can fight that battle on the floor of the House.

But if you read those volumes and end it in the last pages of Volume 2, you know that Director Mueller asked us to finish the task of looking into elements that he did not or could not and the underlying issues.

Let me also say, as we do that, we do it forthrightly because, in 2020, we want to make sure that every American has the right to vote and every American is not undermined by a foreign operative interfering and taking the election away from you.

I support the resolution. We must stand for the rule of law.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 430, authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas and for other purposes.

It is an honor to serve in this body.

We are the successors and heirs to an august freedom earned centuries ago, expanded for successive groups and defended through the blood, sweat and tears of the nation's fighting forces.

It is this debt that took me to the beaches of Normandy to pay my respects on the 75th Anniversary of the D-Day invasion.

We are heirs to this legacy, and we are heirs to this ingenious system of separation of powers.

The system they laid down presumes equality of power among the branches.

As custodians of Article I, we have a duty to ensure the rigors of the Constitution are upheld.

This includes that when the Second Branch, Article II, flouts the investigative prerogatives of the Congress, there must be recourse and accountability.

As a senior member of the House Judiciary Committee, I have to say that it is regrettable that we are here.

This is because a hallmark of our constitutional republic is that no person is above the law.

Congressional oversight has been the tradition going back to the first years of our republic.

And the congressional prerogative of oversight has been a tool in the Article I arsenal as a way of asserting our power and protecting against the worst excesses of an executive.

This comports with the founding of our government, which sought to prevent the concentration of power in an autocratic executive, which was anathema to the Founders.

Which is why the events of the last many months have been so confounding.

The decision by this executive to flout all lawfully authorized subpoenas has been unprecedented.

This dispute between the political branches should work itself out, but because of this presidential obstinacy, we are in this predicament, which is why we must pass this H. Res. 430, Authorizing Subpoena Enforcement Litigation.

This Resolution, H. Res. 430, builds on the House Judiciary Committee's contempt finding against Attorney General Barr.

The resolution authorizes the Committee to seek civil enforcement of its subpoenas against: (i) Attorney General Barr requiring him to provide Congress with the key evidence underlying the Mueller Report as well as the unredacted report itself; and (ii) former White House Counsel Donald F. McGahn, II requiring him to provide documents and appear for testimony.

The resolution further affirms that all committee chairs, when authorized by the Bipartisan Legal Advisory Group, retain the ability to seek civil enforcement of their own subpoenas.

The resolution adds that when committees proceed to court, they have any and all necessary authority under Article I of the Constitution, ensuring that they have the maximum range of legal authority available to them.

For example, on other key issues—such as the Department of Justice defying a subpoena to produce counter-intelligence documents relating to Russia's interference with the 2016 election, or the Commerce Department defying a subpoena to produce documents relating to the addition of a citizenship question to the 2020 Census—the committees can enforce these subpoenas without a floor vote.

This resolution ensures the House can conduct meaningful oversight on issues critical to Americans' lives while continuing to deliver on pocketbook issues.

The President's disregard for congressional oversight allows the Administration to cover-up his many disastrous policy decisions such as: attacking affordable healthcare coverage for millions of Americans including those with pre-existing conditions, tearing apart vulnerable immigrant families, misappropriating military funds for his ill-conceived border wall, and rolling back landmark civil rights protections for minorities.

The information subpoenaed by various congressional committees, including documents and testimony, is information to which Congress is constitutionally entitled and that past Administrations have routinely provided.

President Trump has prevented fact witnesses referenced in the Mueller Report from testifying or providing documents to Congress.

This is despite the fact that the Report detailed the Russian government's sustained attacks on our elections; over 170 contacts between President Trump's campaign and associates and agents of the Russian government; as well as numerous efforts by President Trump to impede or thwart House investigations scrutinizing his own conduct and that of his Administration.

In keeping with the President's sweeping public refusal to comply with congressional subpoenas, the White House and the Administration are fighting to keep the truth from the American people.

This resolution ensures we can conduct oversight on issues that are critical to Americans' lives while continuing to deliver on pocketbook issues.

The information subpoenaed by various congressional committees, including documents and testimony, is information Congress is constitutionally entitled to and which past Administrations have routinely provided.

Congress not only is constitutionally entitled to the underlying evidence in the Special Counsel's Report and key fact witness testimony, it requires this information so that it can fulfill its legislative, oversight, and other constitutional responsibilities.

This resolution follows past precedent used by Democratic and Republican Majorities while reinforcing an important principle in the House Rules.

This Administration's disregard for the legislative and judicial branches has reached a tipping point.

Despite representing a coequal branch of government, this Administration is flagrantly disregarding the role Congress and the Judiciary must play in our democratic system.

Mr. Speaker, the foregoing has been the basis for this Resolution.

It was my hope that this was not needed.

But the President has proven me wrong, which is why this Resolution is needed.

I urge passage of the Resolution.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CLINE), a fellow Judiciary Committee member.

Mr. CLINE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time, and I want to recognize the gentlewoman from Texas for her remarks because, as a fellow member of the Judiciary Committee, we all stand for the rule of law. I, too, carry a Constitution with me.

The Constitution explicitly creates a system that is representative of the people, where the people are elected by their constituents to come up here and represent their views in Congress and vote for them. It is not to come up here and to hand off control, to hand their vote to the majority leader, to the Speaker, and to the majority whip and let them vote for them and for the people of their district whether or not to go to court.

The votes to enforce subpoenas, the votes to hold in contempt should be votes of the Representatives of the people. That is why this resolution today is such a travesty.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, I have only been a Member of this body for a few months, and I was proud to be named a member of the Judiciary Committee, but unfortunately, the circus that I have witnessed over the last few months is shocking, as the Democratic majority tries to find some reason, any reason, to impeach this President now that the Mueller investigation has wrapped up with no crimes found.

If they want to go back and repeat the last 2 years of the investigation, the millions of dollars, the hundreds of subpoenas, they are certainly entitled to do that, but I would argue it would be a waste of time for the American taxpayer and the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we had a hearing earlier today on the 9/11 Victim Compensation Fund, and the chairman did a masterful job of arguing in favor of that legislation, of which I am a cosponsor. It is bipartisan legislation. It is going to be marked up tomorrow. That is the way that this Judiciary Committee should operate.

Instead, we have hearings with empty chairs for the Attorney General, we have a hearing with an empty chair for the White House counsel.

Finally, yesterday we had a hearing with people in the seats, but they were all MSNBC and CNN commentators.

Mr. Speaker, this is a travesty of justice. I would urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary is one of the most venerable in the House of Representatives, and I am honored to have been selected to join its ranks.

It has jurisdiction over intellectual property, during a time of exponential scientific breakthroughs. It has jurisdiction over election interference, during a time when we are concerned about Russians interfering with our election. It has jurisdiction over immigration issues, during a time of an unprecedented security and humanitarian crisis on our southern border.

I am disappointed to see how the Democratic majority has chosen to waste this authority. I am disappointed to see that it has chosen to ignore its responsibilities to the American people in favor of sound bites and photo ops.

Instead of legislating, the Democratic majority prefers posing with buckets of fried chicken for the national media in crude attempts to undermine our President and his administration.

Really?

It is time to move on and tackle the real issues that Americans care about.

The American people elected us, they elected me, to Congress to get things done. Let us secure the border. Let us improve healthcare. Let us improve education.

Let us stop this political theater that happens meeting after meeting and hearing after hearing in multiple committees in what I believe is a blatant attempt to influence the 2020 presidential election using taxpayer resources.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have left and how much time the other side has left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 1 minute remaining.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to use my 1 minute to actually refute these blatant allegations and fantasies, I believe, by my fellow Democrats, and that is how somehow the President and the Department of Justice has been stonewalling them.

Let me go over the timelines really quick.

On March 22, the Attorney General immediately notified the chairmen and the ranking members of the House and Senate Committees on Judiciary that they had received the confidential report from the special counsel.

The next day, the Attorney General informed Congress of the special counsel's principal conclusions.

March 29, he updated the Congress on what could be done and what redactions had to be made.

Then on April 18, less than a month after receiving it, the Attorney General made the redacted confidential report available to Congress and the entire public.

The same day, the Attorney General released the confidential report and made the minimally-redacted version of the confidential report available for review.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge a "no" vote on this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side have responded to this legislation with the same old same old.

They are circling the wagons around this President and his team. They are deliberately turning a blind eye to the corruption, to the deception, to the illegality that has surrounded this White House.

But let me remind them all of why we are here today. We are here because the American people elected each of us to write laws and to ensure those who execute them are accountable.

We all took an oath when we were sworn in to uphold and defend the Constitution. That is our job.

None of us were sent here to play defense for the President of the United States.

There are some things that are more important than politics, and I hope that even in this day and age, there are still some things that are more sacred than partisanship, like the rule of law and the separation of powers.

I mean, each of us took the same oath. We now have a choice whether or not to uphold it.

The choice should be a simple one: to stand up to President Trump and to defend the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when many of my Republican friends ran for office claiming to be constitutional conservatives. Well, this is their chance to back up their campaign slogan with their vote.

We have a President that publicly states: "We're fighting all the subpoenas."

And I don't want people to testify.

Those are his words. Those are the words of the President, not some mob boss.

As we heard from the chairman of the Oversight and Reform Committee, Chairman CUMMINGS, the White House hasn't turned over a single document, a single piece of paper that his committee has requested to do their oversight work, not one piece of paper.

At the core of this resolution is Congress getting the appropriate documents, so we can do the appropriate oversight. That is part of the job.

How can anybody be against that? To be against that is to be part of the

coverup, is to be complicit with the obstruction that this White House demonstrates each and every day.

Mr. Speaker, I remind my colleagues that history will judge how we react to this moment. So I urge all of my colleagues, do not let this moment pass us by. Vote "yes" on this resolution, and let's hold the President accountable.

Nobody is above the law in the United States of America, not even the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are again reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 431, the previous question is ordered on the resolution, as amended.

The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 2609.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 191, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 247]

YEAS—229

Adams	Crow	Higgins (NY)
Agullar	Cuellar	Hill (CA)
Allred	Cummings	Himes
Barragán	Cunningham	Horn, Kendra S.
Bass	Davids (KS)	Horsford
Beatty	Davis, Danny K.	Houlahan
Bera	Dean	Hoyer
Beyer	DeFazio	Huffman
Bishop (GA)	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Blumenauer	DeLauro	Jayapal
Blunt Rochester	DelBene	Jeffries
Bonamici	Delgado	Johnson (GA)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Demings	Johnson (TX)
Brindisi	DeSaunier	Kaptur
Brown (MD)	Deutch	Keating
Brownley (CA)	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Bustos	Doggett	Kennedy
Butterfield	Doyle, Michael F.	Khanna
Carbajal	Engel	Kildee
Cárdenas	Escobar	Kilmer
Carson (IN)	Eshoo	Kim
Cartwright	Españillat	Kind
Case	Evans	Kirkpatrick
Casten (IL)	Finkenauer	Krishnamoorthi
Castor (FL)	Fletcher	Lamb
Castro (TX)	Foster	Langevin
Chu, Judy	Frankel	Larsen (WA)
Ciциlline	Fudge	Larson (CT)
Cisneros	Gallego	Lawrence
Clark (MA)	Garamendi	Lawson (FL)
Clarke (NY)	García (IL)	Lee (CA)
Cleaver	García (TX)	Lee (NV)
Clyburn	Golden	Levin (CA)
Cohen	Gomez	Levin (MI)
Connolly	Gonzalez (TX)	Lewis
Cooper	Gottheimer	Lieu, Ted
Correa	Green (TX)	Lipinski
Costa	Grijalva	Loeb
Courtney	Haaland	Loftgren
Cox (CA)	Harder (CA)	Lowenthal
Craig	Hayes	Lowe
Crist	Heck	Lujan
		Luria

Lynch	Peterson	Smith (WA)
Malinowski	Phillips	Soto
Maloney,	Pingree	Spanberger
Carolyn B.	Pocan	Speier
Maloney, Sean	Porter	Stanton
Matsui	Pressley	Stevens
McAdams	Price (NC)	Suozzi
McBath	Quigley	Swalwell (CA)
McCollum	Raskin	Takano
McEachin	Rice (NY)	Takano
McGovern	Richmond	Thompson (CA)
McNerney	Rose (NY)	Thompson (MS)
Meeks	Rouda	Titus
Meng	Roybal-Allard	Tlaib
Moore	Ruiz	Tonko
Morelle	Ruppersberger	Torres (CA)
Moulton	Rush	Torres Small (NM)
Mucarsel-Powell	Ryan	Trahan
Murphy	Sánchez	Trone
Nadler	Sarbanes	Underwood
Napolitano	Scanlon	Van Drew
Neal	Schakowsky	Vargas
Neguse	Schiff	Veasey
Norcross	Schneider	Vela
O'Halleran	Schrader	Velázquez
Ocasio-Cortez	Schrier	Visclosky
Omar	Scott (VA)	Wasserman
Pallone	Scott, David	Schultz
Panetta	Serrano	Waters
Pappas	Sewell (AL)	Watson Coleman
Pascarella	Shalala	Welch
Payne	Sherman	Wexton
Pelosi	Sherrill	Wild
Perlmutter	Sires	Wilson (FL)
Peters	Slotkin	Yarmuth

NAYS—191

Abraham	Gohmert	Newhouse
Aderholt	Gonzalez (OH)	Norman
Allen	Gooden	Nunes
Amash	Gosar	Olson
Amodel	Granger	Palazzo
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Pence
Babin	Graves (MO)	Perry
Bacon	Grothman	Posey
Baird	Guest	Ratcliffe
Balderson	Guthrie	Reed
Banks	Hagedorn	Reschenthaler
Barr	Harris	Rice (SC)
Bergman	Hartzler	Riggleman
Biggs	Hern, Kevin	Roby
Bilirakis	Hice (GA)	Rodgers (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Higgins (LA)	Roe, David P.
Brady	Hill (AR)	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Rooney (FL)
Buchanan	Hudson	Rose, John W.
Bucshon	Huizenga	Rouzer
Budd	Hunter	Roy
Burchett	Hurd (TX)	Rutherford
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Scalise
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Schweikert
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Scott, Austin
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Sensenbrenner
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Shimkus
Chabot	Joyce (PA)	Simpson
Cheney	Katko	Smith (MO)
Cline	Keller	Smith (NE)
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NJ)
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Smucker
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Spano
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger	Stauber
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Stefanik
Conaway	LaHood	Steil
Cook	LaMalfa	Steube
Crawford	Lamborn	Stewart
Crenshaw	Latta	Stivers
Curtis	Lesko	Taylor
Davidson (OH)	Long	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Thornberry
DesJarlais	Lucas	Timmons
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Tipton
Duffy	Marchant	Turner
Duncan	Marshall	Upton
Dunn	Massie	Wagner
Emmer	Mast	Walberg
Estes	McCarthy	Walden
Ferguson	McCaul	Walker
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Walorski
Fleischmann	McHenry	Waltz
Flores	McKinley	Watkins
Fortenberry	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Foxx (NC)	Meuser	Webster (FL)
Fulcher	Miller	Wenstrup
Gaetz	Mitchell	Westerman
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Williams
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Wilson (SC)
Gibbs	Mullin	

Wittman Woodall Young
Womack Yoho Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Axne Gabbard King (IA)
Bost Green (TN) Kuster (NH)
Buck Griffith Wright
Clay Hastings
Davis (CA) Herrera Beutler

□ 1623

Mr. ZELDIN and Mr. ADERHOLT changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DHS ACQUISITION REVIEW BOARD ACT OF 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2609) to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to establish the Acquisition Review Board in the Department of Homeland Security, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 419, nays 0, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 248]

YEAS—419

Abraham Butterfield Cummings
Adams Byrne Cunningham
Aderholt Calvert Curtis
Aguilar Carbajal Davids (KS)
Allen Cárdenas Davidson (OH)
Allred Carson (IN) Davis, Danny K.
Amash Carter (GA) Davis, Rodney
Amodei Carter (TX) Dean
Armstrong Cartwright DeFazio
Arrington Case DeGette
Babin Casten (IL) DeLauro
Bacon Castor (FL) DeBene
Baird Castro (TX) Delgado
Balderson Chabot Demings
Banks Cheney DeSaulnier
Barr Chu, Judy DesJarlais
Barragán Cicilline Deutch
Bass Cisneros Diaz-Balart
Beatty Clark (MA) Dingell
Bera Clarke (NY) Doggett
Bergman Cleaver Doyle, Michael
Beyer Cline F.
Biggs Cloud Duffy
Bilirakis Clyburn Duncan
Bishop (GA) Cohen Dunn
Bishop (UT) Cole Emmer
Blumenauer Collins (GA) Engel
Blunt Rochester Collins (NY) Escobar
Bonamici Comer Eshoo
Boyle, Brendan Conaway Espallat
F. Connolly Estes
Brady Cook Evans
Brindisi Cooper Ferguson
Brooks (AL) Correa Finkenauer
Brooks (IN) Costa Fitzpatrick
Brown (MD) Courtney Fleischmann
Brownley (CA) Cox (CA) Fletcher
Buchanan Craig Flores
Bucshon Crawford Fortenberry
Budd Crenshaw Foster
Burchett Crist Foxx (NC)
Burgess Crow Frankel
Bustos Cuellar Fudge

Fulcher Gaetz
Gallagher Gallagher
Gallego Garamendi
Garcia (IL) Garcia (TX)
Gianforte Gianforte
Gibbs Gibbs
Gohmert Gohmert
Golden Golden
Gomez Gomez
Gonzalez (OH) Gonzalez (TX)
Gooden Gooden
Gosar Gosar
Gottheimer Gottheimer
Granger Granger
Graves (GA) Graves (LA)
Graves (MO) Graves (MO)
Green (TX) Green (TX)
Grijalva Grijalva
Grothman Grothman
Guest Guest
Guthrie Guthrie
Haaland Haaland
Hagedorn Hagedorn
Harder (CA) Harder (CA)
Harris Harris
Hartzler Hartzler
Hayes Hayes
Heck Heck
Hern, Kevin Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA) Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA) Higgins (LA)
Higgins (NY) Higgins (NY)
Hill (AR) Hill (AR)
Hill (CA) Hill (CA)
Himes Himes
Holding Holding
Hollingsworth Hollingsworth
Horn, Kendra S. Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford Horsford
Houlahan Houlahan
Hoyer Hoyer
Hudson Hudson
Huffman Huffman
Huizenga Huizenga
Hunter Hunter
Hurd (TX) Hurd (TX)
Jackson Lee Jackson Lee
Jayapal Jayapal
Jeffries Jeffries
Johnson (GA) Johnson (GA)
Johnson (LA) Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH) Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD) Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX) Johnson (TX)
Jordan Jordan
Joyce (OH) Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA) Joyce (PA)
Kaptur Kaptur
Katko Katko
Keating Keating
Keller Keller
Kelly (IL) Kelly (IL)
Kelly (MS) Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA) Kelly (PA)
Kennedy Kennedy
Khanna Khanna
Kildee Kildee
Kilmer Kilmer
Kim Kim
Kind Kind
King (NY) King (NY)
Kinzinger Kinzinger
Kirkpatrick Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi Krishnamoorthi
Kustoff (TN) Kustoff (TN)
LaHood LaHood
LaMalfa LaMalfa
Lamb Lamb
Lamborn Lamborn
Langevin Langevin
Larsen (WA) Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT) Larson (CT)
Latta Latta
Lawrence Lawrence
Lawson (FL) Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA) Lee (CA)
Lee (NV) Lee (NV)
Lesko Lesko
Levin (CA) Levin (CA)
Levin (MI) Levin (MI)
Lewis Lewis
Lieu, Ted Lieu, Ted
Lipinski Lipinski
Loebsock Loebsock

Lofgren Long
Long Long
Loudermilk Loudermilk
Lowenthal Lowenthal
Lowe Lowe
Lucas Lucas
Luetkemeyer Luetkemeyer
Luján Luján
Luria Luria
Lynch Lynch
Malinowski Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B. Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean Maloney, Sean
Marchant Marchant
Marshall Marshall
Massie Massie
Mast Mast
Matsui Matsui
McAdams McAdams
McBath McBath
McCarthy McCarthy
McCaul McCaul
McClintock McClintock
Guest Guest
McCollum McCollum
McEachin McEachin
McGovern McGovern
McHenry McHenry
McKinley McKinley
McNerney McNerney
Meadows Meadows
Meeks Meeks
Meng Meng
Meuser Meuser
Miller Miller
Mitchell Mitchell
Moolenaar Moolenaar
Mooney (WV) Mooney (WV)
Moore Moore
Morelle Morelle
Moulton Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell Mucarsel-Powell
Mullin Mullin
Murphy Murphy
Nadler Nadler
Napolitano Napolitano
Neal Neal
Neguse Neguse
Newhouse Newhouse
Norcross Norcross
Norman Norman
Nunes Nunes
O'Halleran O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez Ocasio-Cortez
Olson Olson
Omar Omar
Palazzo Palazzo
Pallone Pallone
Palmer Palmer
Panetta Panetta
Pappas Pappas
Pascrell Pascrell
Payne Payne
Pence Pence
Perlmutter Perlmutter
Perry Perry
Peters Peters
Peterson Peterson
Phillips Phillips
Pingree Pingree
Pocan Pocan
Porter Porter
Posey Posey
Pressley Pressley
Price (NC) Price (NC)
Quigley Quigley
Raskin Raskin
Ratcliffe Ratcliffe
Reed Reed
Reschenthaler Reschenthaler
Rice (NY) Rice (NY)
Rice (SC) Rice (SC)
Richmond Richmond
Riggleman Riggleman
Roby Roby
Rodgers (WA) Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P. Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL) Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY) Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL) Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY) Rose (NY)
Rose, John W. Rose, John W.
Rouda Rouda
Rouzer Rouzer
Roy Roy
Roybal-Allard Roybal-Allard
Ruiz Ruiz
Ruppersberger Ruppersberger
Rush Rush

Rutherford Ryan
Ryan Ryan
Sánchez Sánchez
Sarbanes Sarbanes
Scalise Scalise
Scanlon Scanlon
Schakowsky Schakowsky
Schiff Schiff
Schneider Schneider
Schrader Schrader
Schrier Schrier
Schweikert Schweikert
Scott (VA) Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin Scott, Austin
Scott, David Scott, David
Sensenbrenner Sensenbrenner
Serrano Serrano
Sewell (AL) Sewell (AL)
Shalala Shalala
Sherman Sherman
Sherrill Sherrill
Shimkus Shimkus
Simpson Simpson
Sires Sires
Slotkin Slotkin
Smith (MO) Smith (MO)
Smith (NE) Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ) Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA) Smith (WA)
Smucker Smucker
Soto Soto
Spanberger Spanberger
Spano Spano
Speier Speier
Stanton Stanton
Stauber Stauber
Stefanik Stefanik
Steil Steil
Steube Steube
Stevens Stevens
Stewart Stewart
Stivers Stivers
Suozi Suozi
Swalwell (CA) Swalwell (CA)
Takano Takano
Taylor Taylor
Thompson (CA) Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS) Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA) Thompson (PA)
Thornberry Thornberry
Timmons Timmons
Tipton Tipton
Titus Titus
Tlaib Tlaib
Tonko Tonko
Torres (CA) Torres (CA)
Torres Small Torres Small
(NM) (NM)
Trahan Trahan
Trone Trone
Turner Turner
Underwood Underwood
Upton Upton
Van Drew Van Drew
Vargas Vargas
Veasey Veasey
Vela Vela
Velázquez Velázquez
Visclosky Visclosky
Wagner Wagner
Walberg Walberg
Walden Walden
Walker Walker
Walorski Walorski
Waltz Waltz
Wasserman Wasserman
Schultz Schultz
Waters Waters
Watkins Watkins
Watson Coleman Watson Coleman
Weber (TX) Weber (TX)
Webster (FL) Webster (FL)
Welch Welch
Wenstrup Wenstrup
Westerman Westerman
Wexton Wexton
Wild Wild
Williams Williams
Wilson (FL) Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC) Wilson (SC)
Wittman Wittman
Womack Womack
Woodall Woodall
Yarmuth Yarmuth
Yoho Yoho
Young Young
Zeldin Zeldin

NOT VOTING—13

Axne Gabbard King (IA)
Bost Green (TN) Kuster (NH)
Buck Griffith Wright
Clay Hastings
Davis (CA) Herrera Beutler

□ 1631

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on June 11, 2019 as I had another commitment that did not allow me to make it back to D.C. in time for votes. Had I been present, I would have voted as follows: “no” on rollcall No. 245; “no” on rollcall No. 246; “no” on rollcall No. 247; and “yes” on rollcall No. 248.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. AXNE. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on June 11, 2019 because I was returning to Washington, D.C. Had I been present to vote, I would have voted YEA on H. Res. 430—Authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary to initiate or intervene in judicial proceedings to enforce certain subpoenas, and YEA on H.R. 2609—DHS Acquisition Review Board Act of 2019.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SUR- VIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to immediately schedule the Born-Alive bill because survivors of abortion deserve protection, and the American people deserve a vote on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate at this time.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman seek recognition?

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair has previously advised, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearances.

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. For what purpose does the gentleman seek recognition?

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that Congress is out of order when we fail to protect the least amongst us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not been recognized for debate.

LGBT PRIDE MONTH

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate LGBT Pride Month, which occurs every June.

Pride Month is the time when the LGBT community comes together to celebrate their ability to live freely. For many people across the country, Pride events held in this month of June are the occasion where they can express themselves freely in their community.

This year's LGBT Pride Month marks an important turning point in LGBT history, the 50th anniversary of the Stonewall uprising. While LGBT Pride events today center on celebration of good times, they are rooted in the LGBT community's fight for survival.

Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago this month, police raided the Stonewall Inn, a gay bar in New York City. Raids weren't uncommon at the time, but this time, the gay community rose up in protest. They set off a national movement of LGBT rights, which still is going on today.

Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to celebrate these great strides in LGBT rights in this country. I ask that my colleagues join me in celebrating LGBT Month and commit to protecting the rights and safety of LGBT people.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE GIRL SCOUTS OF COLLIN COUNTY

(Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to congratulate 24 young women from high schools across Plano, Texas, who were presented with the Gold Award by the Girls Scouts of Northeast Texas for their dedication to our community.

The most prestigious accolade to earn, the Gold Award requires each young woman to work tirelessly on a community project of their choice for up to 80 hours.

I want to thank each of these Girl Scouts for their exemplary service within Collin County and for demonstrating that age should never deter one from leading within their community.

It is with pleasure I ask my colleagues to congratulate these young ladies on their success.

LET'S USE OUR POWER TO STOP GUN VIOLENCE

(Mr. CRIST asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CRIST. Madam Speaker, I stand before you 2 days before the third anniversary of the mass shooting at Pulse nightclub in Orlando, Florida, to tell this body, the people's House, that we have work to do.

The Pulse shooting shook us all to our core, and for so many in the LGBTQ community, these wounds may never fully heal.

We honor the memory of those whose lives were taken, but for those 49 people, their families, and, importantly, their chosen families, thoughts and prayers will never be enough.

"Orlando Strong" and "Never Again" are only words until we take action.

We are united by the power our constituents have given to us to make laws. We must use that power to stop gun violence.

What does it say to the victims at Pulse, Marjory Stoneman Douglas, Sandy Hook, Las Vegas, Aurora, Virginia Beach, and too many others to list? Do we not care?

Making life safer for our constituents is not right versus left; it is right versus wrong.

Madam Speaker, I urge action on this national epidemic.

MEXICO'S COMMITMENT TO HELPING SECURE OUR COMMON BORDER

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to commend President Trump on the early success in getting Mexico to increase its commitment to helping secure our common border.

There has been no shortage of doubters, perhaps even some who wished the President would fail because he has taken an approach that hasn't been tried before. But I thank the President for his vision and for his commitment to securing our southern border, which has long been at crisis levels.

We are not done, by any means—we must now ensure that Mexico honors their commitments—but this is significant progress that we haven't seen yet to this point.

If Mexico is true to their word, that means House Democrats are now the only ones preventing the U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement from becoming a reality. This agreement would be extraordinarily beneficial for the American economy, and it is time to ratify it here in this House.

I thank President Trump for applying pressure on Mexico and forcing them to step up their efforts to secure our border and trade.

HONORING HARRY YOA

(Mr. VAN DREW asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VAN DREW. Madam Speaker, Harry Yoa is a 101-year-old World War II veteran. He is living in Ocean City, New Jersey.

He was only 23 years old when he enlisted in the Army in 1942, working as a truck driver and newly married to his wife, Valerie.

In the 321st Bombardment Group in the 12th Air Force, Harry was stationed in the south of France, where he completed 63 missions as an aerial engineer and as a tail gunner.

He now, unfortunately, suffers from dementia and doesn't remember much from the war, but he says he hasn't forgotten the intensity of his missions, where he was tasked with repairing the aircraft and defending the craft through the weapons in the rear of the plane.

After the war, Harry was awarded multiple medals and three Bronze Stars for his service.

In the wake of the 75th anniversary of D-day, we remember the sacrifices of many Americans and the many Americans who made them in World War II.

Harry is truly one of the great ones, and God will bless him.

LIBERTY SHIPS

(Mr. CARTER of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the Liberty ships and those who built them during World War II in Savannah, Georgia.

Just after the U.S. entered the war, the Maritime Commission awarded a contract to the Southeastern Shipbuilding Corporation to start building cargo ships for military service.

The first completed ship was called the USS *Oglethorpe*, named after the city's founder. By the end of the war, 46,000 employees had produced 88 Liberty ships at the Savannah location.

These were America's lifeline to the war in Europe and the workhorses that transferred necessary supplies back and forth across the Atlantic Ocean filled with dangerous obstacles.

Unfortunately, the USS *Oglethorpe* was lost, torpedoed by a German U-boat in 1943. Today, a model of that ship stands at the Savannah trade center to thank and remember all those who served in the Savannah shipyards, constantly working to help win the war, as well as those ship captains who risked their lives crossing the ocean.

This generation truly deserves the name the Greatest Generation, and with them rested the fate of the entirety of Western civilization.

I am proud of this group in the First Congressional District of Georgia and their contribution to the effort during World War II.

□ 1645

SUPPORTING ROHINGYA
REFUGEES

(Ms. OMAR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. OMAR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to speak out against the horrifying human rights abuses that our administration fails to confront.

There are more than 1.3 million Rohingya refugees who have fled the genocide in Burma. About half a million were driven out by a deliberate, coordinated campaign by the Burmese state to destroy Rohingya villages.

According to Human Rights Watch, refugees who arrived in Bangladesh in 2018 reported continued abuses by Burmese security forces, including killings, arson, enforced disappearances, extortion, severe restrictions on movement, and lack of food and healthcare.

They also reported sexual violence and abduction of women and girls in villages and at checkpoints along the route to Bangladesh. Returnees to Myanmar faced arrest and torture by authorities.

There are more than 128,000 Rohingya still in detention camps, where they have been confined since 2012.

At its peak, Rohingya refugee resettlement in the United States was 2,573 refugees in fiscal year 2015. That number has dropped to just 207 in fiscal year 2019.

We are supporting Rohingya refugees through funding programs in refugee camps, but we must do more and help them resettle here in the United States.

INVESTIGATE FALSE ACCUSATION

(Mr. GAETZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GAETZ. Madam Speaker, after the Mueller report, we now know that President Trump was falsely accused of engaging in a criminal conspiracy with Russia for 22 months. So the question is, what to do now that we are aware of that false accusation?

Democrats believe that the right approach is to tweeze through all the President's reactions to being falsely accused. Republicans believe that we should figure out what the root was of the false accusations in the first place.

As we endeavor upon that work, we see across the rotunda in the Senate that harassment of the First Family continues. Donald Trump, Jr., will be hauled before a Senate committee tomorrow because his prior testimony purportedly conflicts with the testimony of Mr. Gates and Mr. Cohen, people who are either in prison for lying or going to prison for lying.

It is past time to stop the harassment of the President and the First Family, acknowledge those who en-

gaged in false accusations for an extended period of time, and figure out how in the world such an accusation was able to be funded by the DNC, cooked up in the Obama White House, and then polluted by Russians.

We can do a lot better, and we are going to figure out what happened.

CELEBRATING 50TH ANNIVERSARY
OF "APOLLO 11"

(Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise today to talk about an important achievement that changed the world as we know it.

In just over a month, we will celebrate the 50th anniversary of the *Apollo 11* mission. On July 20th, 1969, for the first time ever, human beings walked on the Moon.

Apollo 11 was indeed a giant leap. It inspired and continues to inspire generations to explore. The discoveries and technology that come out of America's investment in space not only help us better understand the universe but fundamentally change our modern life.

Apollo 11 is one of America's greatest achievements, and I am proud to work with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, as well as in both the House and the Senate, on resolutions that commemorate and celebrate this achievement.

Celebrating the *Apollo 11* mission ensures that future generations will not just remember, but also take us further into space exploration.

As a lifelong Oklahoman, I also want to acknowledge the unique contributions of Oklahoma astronauts. In each week leading up to the *Apollo 11* mission celebration, I will highlight Oklahomans who shaped our knowledge and discovery within space.

THANKING AMERICANS FOR
SPEAKING AGAINST CONGRES-
SIONAL PAY RAISES

(Mr. CLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today to thank the American people for sending a message to this Congress that they do not want the pay raises for Members of Congress to go through. However, their work is not done, and they need to keep it up.

They have successfully delayed the Legislative Branch appropriations bill from being considered as part of this omnibus bill that is going to be considered tomorrow, but it has only been delayed. It hasn't been removed just yet, so stay on the phones, stay on the emails, and stay on Facebook.

Get in contact with Members of Congress to let them know that their constituents don't think that they deserve a pay raise. They have more work to

do. There is much to be done, in terms of addressing the crisis at the border and continuing in the economic success that we have. Instead, we have many committees that are holding officials in contempt of Congress.

We have more to do, so I ask the American people to keep up the great work.

DEBATE OUT-OF-CONTROL
SPENDING

(Mr. SPANO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SPANO. Madam Speaker, at the start of this Congress, the new Democratic majority promised that legislation would be considered under regular order. Six months into Congress, it is evident that that promise has been abandoned altogether.

Instead, the majority has used a procedural tactic to set spending levels and circumvent the normal budget process. There is now no sign of a 2020 budget resolution coming before the House to set spending levels, so the full House has no opportunity to debate these levels as a standalone bill.

The national debt exceeded \$22 trillion this year. The American people expect us to debate and vote on a budget that will outline the direction of our Nation. However, without having passed the budget, the House will consider a massive spending bill this week that combines five appropriations bills. Altogether, the package includes nearly \$1 trillion in spending. Members will take this vote to spend with no plan or agreement between the House and Senate on an overall budget.

I call on the majority to follow through on its promise of regular order and bring a budget before the House so that we can debate the out-of-control spending and how it can be reined in and reined in now.

CHAOS ON THE SOUTHERN BOR-
DER AND CROWDSOURCING ENVI-
RONMENTAL DATA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. PORTER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, just so staff knows, this will probably be a bit abbreviated because of all the chaos we have going on around us.

There is something I wanted to start with. Typically, we come to the floor to spend time talking about what is happening in the country economically and demographically and what we must do to keep our promises. I sit on the Ways and Means Committee, and I do trade and tax policy.

Before we put that up, I need to touch on something that is incredibly frustrating. Being from Arizona, obviously, we have a border issue. We talk about it; we do nothing.

How many have seen the news in the last couple of days that we have gun battles going on just south of Douglas, Arizona? We may have 9 or 10 people who have lost their lives. We had a teenager get hit by a stray bullet. We have had a couple of folks—apparently, one crawled to the border and is now in an Arizona hospital. A couple are in Arizona hospitals.

Where is the press? Where is the discussion of what is going on? Apparently, we have a war going on in Agua Prieta, just south of Douglas, between these cartels that not only move drugs, but they also exploit human beings.

These are the very cartels that are taking humans, smuggling them and trafficking them up to the border. They are using assault weapons and killing each other. Of course, we would care about that, wouldn't we? Except it doesn't get any news here because it doesn't fit the narrative.

If you love and care for people, could we at least have an honest discussion of what the President has asked for, with some money for humanitarian aid to take care of those who have presented themselves at the border for refugee status? Understand the violence that is spilling over into my State of Arizona and what is going on.

I guess I come to this microphone just frustrated that this story broke yesterday in Arizona. Where is the national outcry? Where is the national understanding of the chaos that is happening along our southern border and the lives that are being lost? Do we or do we not care about people?

There were two things I wanted to do, and I know we are up against a very tight time, so I am just going to do one of them.

We have this theory that basically says, if you look at U.S. demographics, in 8.5 years, it is two workers, one retiree. In 8.5 years, 50 percent of the budget from this body, less interest, will be to those 65 and older.

Demographics aren't Republican. They are not Democratic. They are math.

We must do a number of things to keep the economic vitality of this society going if we are going to keep our promises. One of those things in our five points is the way we deal with regulations. We have this one area we talk about, whether it be tax policy, trade policy, or regulatory policy. Just in a couple of minutes here, I wanted to explain what smart regulation is.

So often when hearing the rhetoric, we will have: Well, we need to deregulate. We need to reregulate.

That is wrong. We all walk around with these supercomputers in our pockets. It turns out, technology is the rational place where regulation should go.

Here is my thought experiment. Let's use our own neighborhoods. We are the businesses in those neighborhoods. We need to get air quality permits for manufacturing. Does filling out a bunch of paper and shoving it in file

cabinets make air quality cleaner in our neighborhoods? Do file cabinets full of paperwork at the local, county, State, wherever our regulators are, does that make the air quality in our communities better? Of course not. It just creates a lot of documents so that we have someone to sue for the trial lawyers and those things.

I want to propose the concept of crowdsourcing environmental information, particularly for air quality. It turns out, we are living in a time where there are now sensors we can attach to our phones that are highly accurate that will do PM10, hydrocarbons, and volatile organics. What would happen in our communities if we were willing to take this tradeoff?

We are not going to make everyone fill out lots of paperwork. We are going to promote businesses, let them grow. But here is the trick: If they screw up, we catch them instantly.

Also, the clowns painting cars behind everyone's houses in their backyards, we are going to catch them, too.

This thought is very simple. We have a YouTube cartoon that is about 1.5 minutes that walks through this concept of crowdsourcing environmental data. It shows that it is time to use this type of technology. Think of the economic growth tradeoff.

We are not going to fill up file cabinets full of paperwork. Because we are going to be crowdsourcing environmental data, when there is a bad actor, or someone's scrubbers are out of compliance, or there are clowns painting cars in backyards, we will catch them instantly.

Wouldn't that be a lot more powerful, where environmental regulators of communities, States, and counties are now a quick reaction force that goes to where the bad acts are happening instead of basically being paperwork domiciles?

That is an example of smart regulation. It makes communities healthier. It makes air quality better. It still has businesses growing because they are not buried under consultants and mounds of paper. That is an example of smart regulation.

How do we drag this institution into understanding the incredible opportunities that technology is bringing in crashing the price of healthcare and making the environment healthier? In the coming weeks, I am going to come back to dive into this much deeper, but let me salt the mine a little bit for a thought experiment.

What would happen if we had technology that could protect houses of worship, schools, this body, and public buildings? It turns out that it exists today.

I want to propose that this body put together an XPRIZE for nonlethal protection of our buildings and our houses of worship. We already know there are experiments out there with pods that go on the wall, so if someone comes in and is engaged in a bad act or discharges a firearm, instantly, just like

the Taser darts, it lays them down. Yes, innocent people will get hit with them, but they don't die.

It turns out that there are technology solutions that will make us safer.

□ 1700

How do we drag the conversations around this place to understand there are really great, exciting opportunities for all of us out there, whether it be in smart regulation, whether it be the end of killing using technology, whether it be the fact we are about to get dramatically healthier, and that the cures that are about to come on the market for diseases that have been with us for so long, we are in a time of amazing disruption?

How do we future-proof our policies, and how do we get this body to stop thinking everything is either Democrat or Republican, but understand there are actual solutions, you just have to be forward-thinking with technology?

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

HONORING JOHN RUFFIER DURING PRIDE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Pride Month, I would like to honor John Ruffier.

John Daniel Ruffier is an attorney and leader of the LGBTQ community in central Florida. John was born in Orlando, Florida, and attended Edgewater High School where he was part of the State champion men's crew team.

He went on to attend Vanderbilt University and then the University of Florida College of Law. Upon graduation from law school, John joined the law firm of Lowndes, Drosdick, Doster, Kantor & Reed in Orlando where he practices to this day, sitting on the firm's executive committee and leading the firm's senior housing practice group.

John has been involved in numerous community activities having served on the board of directors for both the Central Florida Coalition for the Homeless and the Hope and Health Center of Central Florida.

Along with Jennifer Foster, John founded the central Florida chapter of the Human Rights Campaign and later joined HRC's national board of governors. Following his term on HRC's board of governors, he was asked to join the board of directors for the HRC Foundation. John was also elected to the Human Rights Campaign's political board where he rose to the role of board chair in the years 2018 to 2019.

For that, John Ruffier, we honor you.

HONORING DR. GEORGE WALLACE DURING PRIDE MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Pride Month, I would like to honor Dr. George Wallace.

Dr. George Wallace was born in New Hampshire and moved to central Florida in 1992. He returned to New England in 1995, and after finishing his undergraduate degree, he returned to Florida in 2002.

George spent the first half of his career advocating and working with persons with disabilities as a case manager and later turned his passion for arts into a career as a senior leader of the Orlando Fringe.

During the Pulse tragedy, George was serving on the board of the LGBT+ Center of Orlando. Knowing that he wanted to continue serving his community, he accepted the role as executive director of The Center in Orlando in 2017. Dr. Wallace has since grown the organization to include a programming center at its satellite office in Kissimmee in our district.

George is a very visible leader within central Florida and enjoys travel, photography, and cheering on the Boston Red Sox in his free time.

For that, Dr. George Wallace, we honor you.

HONORING ERIC ROLLINGS DURING PRIDE MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Pride Month, I would like to honor Eric Rollings.

After 30 years of change, of loss, and of victories, Eric Rollings continues to be one of the most active and visible LGBT leaders in Orange County.

Eric started volunteering at the Hope and Help Center in the early 1990s because he witnessed the injustices and stigma that his friends suffered from HIV/AIDS as they were dealing with it every day. In 1993, he was awarded the Volunteer of the Year for his dedication.

In the present day, Eric is serving his sixth term on the Community Development Block Grant Board and helps secure funding for the LGBT+ Center of central Florida and helps make recommendations for housing and services for people living with HIV/AIDS and low- to moderate-income households in the Orlando area.

In Eric's early small business career he was discriminated against for being gay. He saw an opportunity to help educate other business entrepreneurs and worked to provide a safe business environment. With that, he helped grow the Metropolitan Business Association, the LGBT Chamber of Commerce, serving on the board of directors twice.

Eric, with many of his friends and activist allies, was instrumental in passing ordinances and protections for the LGBT people of the city of Orlando and Orange County. In the early days, nothing was certain, but because they did not give up on Orlando and Orange County, today our home is one of the most inclusive, welcoming, and economically vibrant areas in the Nation.

After the Pulse tragedy, all of Orlando came together and became Orlando United. Eric was honored with an Orlando United Medal from Mayor Teresa Jacobs. Eric was elected as one of

the first openly LGBT people to serve in an Orange County-wide position. He worked as chairman of our Soil and Water Conservation Board. He continues to work now politically to improve our environment and to stand up for equality for all, including a ban on conversion therapy.

For that, Mr. Eric Rollings, we honor you.

HONORING RICARDO NEGRON-ALMODOVAR DURING PRIDE MONTH.

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Pride Month, I would like to honor Ricardo Negron-Almodovar.

Born and raised in Puerto Rico, Ricardo obtained a master's degree in education, a juris doctorate, and is a licensed attorney in Puerto Rico.

In 2015 Ricardo moved from Yauco, Puerto Rico, to Orlando, Florida. During his first year in Florida, he taught English to adults and became involved in civic engagement efforts to register new voters.

After the Pulse tragedy on June 12, 2016, of which he is a survivor, Ricardo worked to empower the LGBTQ Latinx community and has advocated against discrimination and gun violence. Ricardo currently serves as a legal service coordinator for LatinoJustice where he has had the opportunity to assist those transitioning from Puerto Rico to Florida after Hurricane Maria devastated my family's native island.

Recently Ricardo obtained a master's degree in nonprofit management and launched the community organization Del Ambiente, which is an effort led by the LGBTQ Puerto Rican community to build up the LGBTQ Puerto Rican community in Florida's activism in environmental work.

For that, Ricardo Negron-Almodovar, we honor you.

HONORING KAREN CASTELLOES DURING PRIDE MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Pride Month, I would like to honor Karen Castelloes.

In 1971, Karen graduated from the University of Cincinnati with a BA in Spanish. After moving to Orlando in 1975, she attained her master's degree in education from Nova University and was employed by Orange County Public Schools as an English to Speakers of Other Languages teacher, an ESOL teacher, for 31 years.

She retired in 2007 and became involved in volunteer work. She is the cofounder of the Jefferson R. Voss Scholarship for Zebra Coalition youth. She served as a member of the Equality Florida Steering Committee for 3 years and presently holds the position of vice chair.

She continues to volunteer at IDignity of Orlando and at the food pantry at Joy MCC. In addition, she proudly serves on the education fund at the Zebra Coalition organization which serves LGBTQ youth.

For that, Karen Castelloes, we honor you.

HONORING DAVID ARTHUR JONES DURING PRIDE MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Pride Month, I would like to honor David Arthur Jones.

David Arthur Jones, son of Mary Lou Jones and the late Arthur Henderson Jones, Jr. was born and raised in a union household in upstate New York. The environment of David's upbringing provided a foundation of values associated with human rights to which he has been largely committed to over the course of his lifetime.

After surviving a raucous adolescence, David served with the United States Jaycees and the New York Young Democrats and was awarded the prestigious Governorship Award which confers an honorary lifetime membership. Among his proudest works was the establishment of a spacious town park in Whitestown, New York.

David went on to enroll at the Mohawk Valley Community College and Utica College of Syracuse University where he earned his degree in occupational therapy.

Together, John and David moved to Lake Wales, Florida, in 2004, in Florida's Ninth Congressional District. As a committeeman, David incorporated LGBT issues as part of meetings of the Polk County Democratic Committee.

In 2001, David and his life partner, John, officially certified their love for each other by virtue of marriage in Utica, New York. David and John spearheaded the effort to establish the Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, Transgender, and Allies Democratic Caucus of Polk County. In that same year, David became a Florida LGBTQA Democratic Caucus regional director serving six counties, including Polk, Lake, Osceola, Orange, Seminole, and Volusia County, of which I am proud to represent much of that area.

David is now in his fifth term serving as the area's regional director. Currently David Jones is focusing on securing all-inclusive human rights ordinances in municipalities within Polk County. Thus far, David has spoken before the commissions of three Polk County cities and has recruited a number of supporters to do the same in the quest to secure fundamental rights for all, and our office has helped in that effort.

David is extremely grateful for the public support that has been given by Florida House Representative Sam Kilbreth and our office, Team Soto, towards securing all-inclusive human rights ordinances, securing the effort as being one of bipartisanship.

For that, David Arthur Jones, we honor you.

HONORING ANTHONY H. SANDONATO DURING PRIDE MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Pride Month, I would like to honor Anthony H. Sandonato.

Anthony is a proud Orlando resident, human resources executive, LGBTQ community advocate, and a member of the Human Rights Campaign's national board of governors.

Originally from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, Anthony currently resides with his husband, Tracer Foster, in downtown Orlando, Florida.

After completing his bachelor's degree in education from Edinboro University of Pennsylvania, Anthony relocated to Fort Lauderdale, Florida, in 1995 to pursue his career. It was there that he took on his first role in human resources with a Miami-based retailer.

Anthony began volunteering to effect change for the LGBT community. He took on volunteer leadership roles with south Florida's volunteer committee for the Human Rights Campaign, the Nation's largest LGBTQ advocacy group and political lobbying organization in the United States.

Anthony volunteered through HRC to protect Miami-Dade's hard-won human rights ordinance and to attempt to stop the passage of Florida's 2008 amendment which ultimately banned gay marriage and civil unions in that State until 2015.

At the Federal level, Anthony championed HRC's efforts in south Florida to achieve the passage of the Matthew Shepard Hate Crimes Act, the repeal of the Don't Ask, Don't Tell policy, and the decade-long effort to pass the Employment Nondiscrimination Act, otherwise known as ENDA.

Anthony moved to Orlando in 2012. Shortly after relocating, he joined HRC's Orlando/central Florida volunteer committee and continued his LGBTQ advocacy as a political and community engagement leader. His focus in central Florida has been to continue his efforts to influence policy by coordinating local get-out-the-vote campaigns and by working with community leaders and Members of the House and Senate for repeal of the current administration's transgender military ban and the passage of the Equality Act, which I am proud, Madam Speaker, we passed out of this House earlier this year.

For that, Anthony H. Sandonato, we honor you.

HONORING NIKOLE PARKER DURING PRIDE MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Pride Month, I would like to honor Nikole Parker.

Nikole Parker is a transgender woman of Puerto Rican, Italian, and African American descent. She was born and raised in Orlando, Florida, and at the age of 19 left her job and her home to begin her transition. After 3 years of black-market hormones and unsafe lifestyle practices she came back to Orlando to restart her life.

Nikole's passion in advocating for the rights and dignity of transgender and gender-nonconforming community is legendary in central Florida. She currently works for onePULSE Foundation as the event and community outreach coordinator. Nikole also sits on various nonprofit boards within the community, including the LGBT+ Center and the Orlando United Assistance Center.

In addition to her work with the onePULSE Foundation, Nikole coleads the work of the Orlando Trans Awareness Collective, a collaborative group of transgender and gender nonconforming leaders of color who have focused on community building and advocacy efforts for the central Florida transgender community.

In 2018, Nikole was honored with the Humanitarian of the Year Award by the Miss Glamorous Pageant for her ongoing advocacy and empowerment of the transgender community and work with the onePULSE Foundation.

She hopes to educate individuals from the community on healthy and safe ways to undergo transition, providing resources so black-market hormones and unsafe lifestyles can be avoided.

For that, Nikole Parker, we honor you.

□ 1715

HONORING DIEUSEUL BERTO DURING CARIBBEAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Caribbean Heritage Month, I would like to honor Dieuseul Berto.

Dieuseul Berto is a Haitian American immigrant who was a former kick boxer and founder of Tiger's World Martial Arts and Boxing Fitness, founded in Winter Haven, Florida, in Florida's Ninth Congressional District. He competed in the UFC.

Berto was known as the man who helped so many people. He was recognized for his conception of a cardiovascular weight loss training program.

Although Berto was injured in a horrendous car accident that left him in a wheelchair for over a year, he did not let the accident define or confine him. Therefore, Dieuseul Berto began creating ways to self-train in his wheelchair by including pushups and the use of a punching bag, which served as a catalyst for his cardio program. He then incorporated those techniques used in the workout.

Berto's fitness program is credited with helping more than 1,200 people gain access to better health by shedding unwanted and unhealthy pounds, resulting in lowering blood pressure and cholesterol concerns over the past 20 years. He is considered a pioneer in helping people with their health and, consequently, their self-confidence.

He was also a family man who helped many kids and tried to keep them out of trouble with his kids program. Berto also mentored children and encouraged them to never sell themselves short by reiterating that any dream is possible and attainable with hard work and dedication. He is credited with teaching children to set larger-than-life expectations for themselves.

He interacted, impacted, and inspired people from all aspects of life.

Berto and his wife are the parents of seven children, including Andre Berto, a two-time former welterweight world champion; Edson and Revelina, who are also professional mixed martial artists; and his son Cleveland, who is an actor.

Madam Speaker, for that, we honor Dieuseul Berto.

HONORING CASMORE SHAW DURING CARIBBEAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Caribbean Heritage Month, I would like to honor Casmore Shaw.

Casmore Shaw moved to Osceola County in the mid-eighties from New York, where he worked as associate dean for the International Students and High School Program and as the director of admissions and student enrollment at Technical Career Institutes. Before that, he taught at Mona Preparatory School in Kingston, Jamaica.

Casmore currently serves on the Osceola County Housing and Finance Authority Advisory Board and the regional board of MetroPlan Citizens Transportation Advisory Committee as well.

He is also the State committee man for the Osceola Democrats and the vice chair of the Osceola Democratic Executive Committee. Casmore is the State secretary for the Florida Democratic Party. He is also a member of the Osceola Education Foundation and the Caribbean and Floridian Association.

Casmore is a founding member of the Kissimmee and Kissimmee South Poinciana Rotary Clubs. He served as past chairman of the Osceola Charter Review Commission, past chair of the Osceola Land Conservation Advisory Board, past chairman of the board of directors of the Osceola County Library System, past president and vice president of the Caribbean and Floridian Association, past chair of the Osceola County School District's Affirmative Action Advisory Board, and the conflict resolution officer and mediator of the Ninth Judicial Circuit of Osceola County.

Casmore holds a graduate degree in curriculum instruction, with a minor in reading intervention, from Concordia University, as well as degrees in elementary education and business administration, with a concentration in supervision and management, and an advanced certificate in healthcare administration.

He worked at Polk State College in the Student Service department and was director for My Brother's Keeper, a program for homeless and vulnerable students. He was also the co-adviser to the Pearl of a Nation Haitian Service Club.

Casmore is married to Jennifer Mitchell, and they have four daughters: Toni-Ann, Deirdre, Dionne, and Jennise.

Madam Speaker, for that, we honor Mr. Casmore Shaw.

HONORING WAYNE GOLDING DURING CARIBBEAN HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Caribbean Heritage Month, I would like to honor Wayne Golding, Sr., Esquire, who was born in Kingston, Jamaica.

After his graduation from high school, he immigrated to New York

with his mother and younger brother in 1981. He went on to graduate from Queens College, CUNY, with a BA in economics and worked on Wall Street.

In 1988, he moved his young family to Orlando, Florida. Wayne earned his juris doctorate of law from Barry University School of Law.

Even as an accomplished attorney practicing in the Florida State courts, the United States courts, and immigration court, he has continued his work as a community leader and activist.

In 2004, he established the litigation law firm, The Golding Law Group, PLC, based in Orlando, Florida. Mr. Golding has served as president of the Caribbean Bar Association's Central Florida chapter.

As an immigrant, he made history when he was selected to serve as chairman of the Orange County School Board Biracial Committee.

Since August 2015, Mr. Golding has been selected to serve as the Jamaica Diaspora Advisory Board member of the southern USA. In this role, he confidently advises the minister of foreign affairs for the Government of Jamaica on Jamaica diaspora issues.

He has been laser focused on methodically galvanizing the skills and talent of the members of the Caribbean community and strengthening the voice of the Caribbean communities in the spaces they reside.

Notably, he continues to be involved with the planning and execution of the annual celebration of Caribbean American Heritage Month.

Wayne credits his drive and commitment to his community to the lessons learned from his grandparents; the support of his wife of 30 years, Lois A. Golding; from their two children, Tassanee Golding and Wayne Golding, Jr.; his mother, Minett Gayle-Brown; as well as a host of mentors and leaders on whose shoulders he stands.

Madam Speaker, for that, we honor Mr. Wayne Golding.

HONORING JOHN PERRY DURING CARIBBEAN
HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Caribbean Heritage Month, I would like to honor John Perry.

Mr. John Everton Perry was born in Kingston, Jamaica, in August 1955. He migrated to New York in 1967 and attended junior high school at Mount Vernon's Washington Junior High, where he received the certificate for outstanding writing presented by the actor-community activist Mr. Ossie Davis.

Mr. PERRY went on to attend Mount Vernon High School, where he lettered in football as a quarterback and also in track. He was a voice on the student council as head school marshal.

After high school, Mr. PERRY enlisted in the United States Air Force, where he served honorably for 5 years. During this time, Mr. PERRY found time to attend The Ohio State University, Park College, and Rollins College.

Mr. PERRY's first passion is as a fishmonger. He has worked in the seafood

industry since the age of 13, but, along the way, he has worked in corporate America: in sales for Brach's Candy, as a tile and gap filler specialist for the U.S. Space Shuttle program at KSC, and financial labor auditor with the Lockheed Corporation.

John now works as an independent insurance counselor in the employees' benefit arena, a relocation specialist, and a LegalShield director.

For the last 4 years, Mr. PERRY has been on WOTS 1220AM in Kissimmee, Caribbean Rhythms Radio Saturday, from 10 a.m. to 2 p.m., in the "A Little Bit of Everything" commentary show on the subject of the day.

Mr. PERRY has been a devoted husband to Mrs. Cecilia LaVerne Perry for the last 43 years. They were blessed with two outstanding children, John, Jr., and Jonnell Evette Perry, and also their two grandchildren, Makayla Perry and Johntae Perry.

Madam Speaker, for that, we honor Mr. John Perry.

HONORING LOUIS WITTER DURING CARIBBEAN
HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Caribbean Heritage Month, I would like to honor Louis Witter.

Louis Witter has been a longstanding businessman in the hospitality industry in the central Florida area since 1992.

He attended Florida Technical College, where he gained his knowledge in business administration and management. He is a current member of the Caribbean and Floridian Association, Inc.; Restore the Path for Christ Church; and the Jamaica Diaspora group, Southeastern Division.

Louis Witter is an entrepreneur, a Caribbean restaurant owner, and a producer and host of Caribbean Rhythms Radio Network AM1220 WOTS, a local Caribbean radio station in the Kissimmee, Florida, area.

This radio station provides vital sources of business, social networking, events, and community information, interviews, and has been a voice to the central Florida Caribbean communities for the past 20 years.

He has used the radio platform to provide internships to over 50 individuals who have successfully completed programs at the radio station and have moved on to pursue careers in the radio broadcasting industry.

Louis Witter is from the Caribbean island of Jamaica. He has lived in the United States for over 30 years.

When he is not involved with business, he enjoys listening to cultural reggae music. He believes that reggae music speaks to all nations, with a strong message in each song.

Louis Witter lives in Davenport, Florida, and can be heard online every Saturday at www.crrnetwork.com, on his broadcasts.

Madam Speaker, for that, we honor Mr. Louis Witter.

HONORING SHELLEY BRIGGS DURING CARIBBEAN
HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. SOTO. Madam Speaker, in honor of Caribbean Heritage Month, I would like to honor Shelley Briggs.

Shelley Ann Briggs was born in London, England, on July 5 to the late Joan Ann Grant. Joan had migrated to London from Georgetown, Guyana, to complete her studies, and, due to hardships, Shelley was sent to Georgetown, Guyana, to live with her grandmother when she was a baby.

Seeking better opportunities and a better life for her family, her grandmother migrated to the United States of America when Shelley was 4 years old, soon settling in Brooklyn, New York.

As a child growing up, Shelley was raised under Guyanese traditions and customs, and, even though she lived in Brooklyn, the neighborhood reflected the West Indian culture Shelley grew to admire.

Shelley attended several private schools and graduated from Catherine McAuley High School. During this time, she also became a U.S. citizen through the help of her mother, who had joined the family in the U.S. when Shelley was 10 years old.

After high school, Shelley made the decision to join the United States Army after attending college for one semester. Shelley then relocated to Florida to help take care of her mother, who had been diagnosed with cancer.

While in Florida, her mother introduced her to the Caribbean and Floridian Association, and soon Shelley became a member. She has served CAFA in a variety of capacities over the last 20 years, and currently she is chairperson for the Service and Education Committee.

She is currently employed as a dean at Gateway High School, located in Osceola County School District in Florida's Ninth Congressional District.

Shelley's life passion has always been children, and there has been a special place in her heart for children whose parents left their home country and came to the United States in search of a better life for their family.

Shelley is happily married to Dennis Briggs and is the proud mother to Jada; Jourard; Dennis, Jr.; and Deyonce.

Madam Speaker, for that, we honor Mrs. Shelley Briggs.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2105

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN) at 9 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO CONGRESSIONAL-EXECUTIVE COMMISSION ON THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 6913, and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Member on the part of the House to the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

Mrs. HARTZLER, Missouri

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO HOUSE COMMISSION ON CONGRESSIONAL MAILING STANDARDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair announces the Speaker's appointment, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 501(b), and the order of the House of January 3, 2019, of the following Members to the House Commission on Congressional Mailing Standards:

Mr. STEIL, Wisconsin

Mr. LATTA, Ohio

Mr. WALKER, North Carolina

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2740, DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2020

Mrs. TORRES of California, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-111) on the resolution (H. Res. 436) providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 6 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 12, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1243. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Mark A. Brilakis, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-

106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1244. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing twelve (12) officers to wear the insignia of the grade of major general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777a(b)(4); Public Law 111-383, Sec. 505(a)(1); (124 Stat. 4208); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1245. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Medical and Dental Care for Eligible Persons at Navy Department Facilities [Docket ID: USN-2019-HQ-0002] (RIN: 0703-AB09) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1246. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Missing Persons Act [Docket ID: USN-2018-HQ-0020] (RIN: 0703-AB07) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1247. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Rules With Respect to Additional Station and Signal Lights [Docket ID: USN-2018-HQ-0010] (RIN: 0703-AB04) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1248. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Certifications and Exemptions Under the International Regulations for Preventing Collisions at Sea, 1972 [Docket ID: USN-2018-HQ-0011] (RIN: 0703-AB03) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1249. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Garnishment of Pay of Naval Military and Civilian Personnel for Collection of Child Support and Alimony [Docket ID: USN-2017-HQ-0007] (RIN: 0703-AA97) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1250. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Assistance to and Support of Dependents; Paternity Complaints [Docket ID: USN-2017-HQ-0006] (RIN: 0703-AA96) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1251. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Non Naval Medical and Dental Care [Docket ID: USN-2019-HQ-0003] (RIN: 0703-AB10) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1252. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Payments of Amounts Due Mentally Incompetent Members of the Naval Service [Docket ID: USN-2019-HQ-0004] (RIN: 0703-AB16) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A);

Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1253. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Contract Administration [Docket ID: USN-2018-DARS-0022] (RIN: 0703-AB14) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1254. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Contracting by Negotiation [Docket ID: USN-2018-DARS-0021] (RIN: 0703-AB13) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1255. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rules Governing Public Access [Docket ID: USN-2018-HQ-0006] (RIN: 0703-AB00) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1256. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Disposition of Property [Docket ID: USN-2018-HQ-0002] (RIN: 0703-AB05) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1257. A letter from the Federal Register Liaison Officer, Office of the Judge Advocate General, Department of the Navy, transmitting the Department's final rule — United States Navy Regulations and Official Records [Docket ID: USN-2019-HQ-0005] (RIN: 703-AB06) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1258. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's Major final rule — Form CRS Relationship Summary; Amendments to Form ADV [Release Nos.: 34-86032; IA-5247; File No.: S7-08-18] (RIN: 3235-AL27) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1259. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's interpretation — Commission Interpretation Regarding Standard of Conduct for Investment Advisers [Release No.: IA-5248; File No.: S7-07-18] (RIN: 3235-AM36) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1260. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's interpretation — Commission Interpretation Regarding the Solely Incidental Prong of the Broker-Dealer Exclusion from the Definition of Investment Adviser [Release No.: IA-5249] received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1261. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's Semiannual Report to Congress, covering the six-month period ending March 31, 2019, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1262. A letter from the Inspector General, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation,

transmitting the Corporation's Semiannual Report to the Congress for the period ending March 31, 2019; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

1263. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Testing and Training Activities Conducted in the Eglin Gulf Test and Training Range in the Gulf of Mexico [Docket No.: 170831846-8105-02] (RIN: 0648-BH21) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

1264. A letter from the Regulations Development Coordinator, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Urgent Care (RIN: 2900-AQ47) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1265. A letter from the Regulations Development Coordinator, Office of Regulations Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Veterans Community Care Program (RIN: 2900-AQ46) received June 7, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DEFAZIO: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 367. A bill making appropriations for Coast Guard pay in the event an appropriations Act expires before the enactment of a new appropriations Act; with an amendment (Rept. 116-110, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mrs. TORRES of California: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 436. Resolution providing for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 2740) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2020, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-111). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 3190. A bill to authorize humanitarian assistance and impose sanctions with respect to human rights abuses in Burma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, the Judiciary, Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIM (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 3191. A bill to expand eligibility for the My Career Advancement Account pro-

gram of the Department of Defense to certain military spouses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself and Mr. STEWART):

H.R. 3192. A bill to add suicide prevention resources to school identification cards; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. GARAMENDI (for himself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. PETERS, Mr. BERA, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. VARGAS):

H.R. 3193. A bill to modify the treatment of deadlines for emergency relief funds awarded by the Secretary of Transportation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. MCCAUL):

H.R. 3194. A bill to provide financial lending mechanisms to assist North Atlantic Treaty Organization allies in modernizing their military forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. VAN DREW (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. SABLÁN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. COX of California, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. ZELDIN):

H.R. 3195. A bill to amend title 54, United States Code, to provide permanent, dedicated funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas (for herself and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 3196. A bill to designate the Large Synoptic Survey Telescope as the "Vera Rubin Survey Telescope"; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. RYAN, Ms. WATERS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. OMAR, Mr. POCAN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SIREN, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. BEYER, Ms. WILD, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. KENNEDY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. NORCROSS, and Ms. PRESSLEY):

H.R. 3197. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to establish a minimum salary threshold for bona fide executive, administrative, and professional employees exempt from Federal overtime compensation requirements, and automatically update such threshold every 3 years; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK (for himself and Mr. GOTTHEIMER):

H.R. 3198. A bill to amend the Economic Growth and Regulatory Paperwork Reduc-

tion Act of 1996 to ensure that Federal financial regulators perform a comprehensive review of regulations to identify outdated or otherwise unnecessary regulatory requirements imposed on covered persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Mr. CLINE):

H.R. 3199. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to prevent double patenting, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MASSIE (for himself, Mr. AMASH, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. COMER, and Mr. BABIN):

H.R. 3200. A bill to repeal the Gun-Free School Zones Act of 1990 and amendments to that Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BEATTY (for herself, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KAPTUR, and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 3201. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to prohibit a State from removing the name of any registrant from the official list of voters eligible to vote in elections for Federal office in the State unless the State verifies, on the basis of objective and reliable evidence, that the registrant is ineligible to vote in such elections; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland (for himself and Ms. SPANBERGER):

H.R. 3202. A bill to require a report on the value of investments in dual use infrastructure projects by the member states of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in order to improve military mobility and interoperability across Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DEUTCH (for himself and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 3203. A bill to provide research, development, and deployment of marine energy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself and Mrs. KIRKPATRICK):

H.R. 3204. A bill to establish responsibility for the International Outfall Interceptor; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. TLAIB, and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 3205. A bill to amend title 14, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of the department in which the Coast Guard is operating, in coordination with the Secretary of Education, to establish programs for the purpose of improving the mathematics and scientific knowledge and skills of elementary and secondary school students and faculty members, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KINZINGER (for himself, Mr. PENCE, and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 3206. A bill to impose sanctions with respect to the provision of certain vessels for the construction of Russian energy export pipelines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LAMB (for himself, Ms. WILD, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. RESCHENTHALER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3207. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 114 Mill Street in Hookstown, Pennsylvania, as the "Staff Sergeant Dylan Elchin Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Ms. SHALALA):

H.R. 3208. A bill to ensure that older adults and individuals with disabilities are prepared for disasters, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 3209. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to codify requirements for changes in airport sponsorship or operations with respect to airport operating certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL (for herself and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana):

H.R. 3210. A bill to require the Commandant of the Coast Guard to take certain steps to improve Coast Guard shore infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Ms. HERERA BEUTLER, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 3211. A bill to establish the Task Force on the Impact of the Affordable Housing Crisis, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Ms. SPIER, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Ms. OMAR, Ms. MENG, and Ms. FRANKEL):

H.R. 3212. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to include in the Annual Country Reports on Human Rights Practices a section on conflict-related sexual and gender-based violence, to amend the Global Magnitsky Human Rights Accountability Act to authorize the President to impose economic sanctions and a visa ban on the leader of an organization that commits sexual or gender-based violence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. FLEISCHMANN, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. GREEN of Tennessee, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee):

H.R. 3213. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to clarify the treatment of certain retirement plan contributions picked up by governmental employers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Mr. CROW, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LYNCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 3214. A bill to repeal the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, and provide for the discoverability and admissibility of gun trace information in civil proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. SHALALA (for herself, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. NORTON, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 3215. A bill to provide Medicaid assistance to individuals and families affected by a disaster or emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TRAHAN (for herself, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. CISNEROS):

H.R. 3216. A bill to enhance efforts to prevent sexual assault in the Armed Forces, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 3217. A bill to require Congress to budget in advance for disasters and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Budget, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESAULNIER (for himself and Ms. LEE of California):

H. Con. Res. 49. Concurrent resolution recognizing the victims of the Port Chicago explosion of July 17, 1944, the 75th anniversary of the greatest homeland loss of life of World War II, and exonerating the 50 African-American sailors unjustly court-martialed by the Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself, Mr. Rouda, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. MEADOWS):

H. Res. 435. A resolution recognizing the contributions of the Montagnard indigenous tribespeople of the Central Highlands of Vietnam to the United States Armed Forces during the Vietnam War, and condemning the ongoing violation of human rights by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PRESSLEY (for herself and Mrs. MCBATH):

H. Res. 437. A resolution expressing support for the designation of November 20 through December 20 as "National Survivors of Homicide Victims Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

70. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Michigan, relative to House Resolution No. 101, urging the U.S. Congress to enact legislation preventing federal regulators from sanctioning depository institutions for providing financial services to legitimate marijuana-related businesses in states where marijuana has been legalized; to the Committee on Financial Services.

71. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, relative to House Concurrent Memorial 2001, urging the United States Congress to enact legislation to provide medical treatment and other benefits for deported veterans of the United States Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

72. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 7,

memorializing the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to authorize the garnishment of veterans' disability benefits to fulfill child support obligations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 3191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 3192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. GARAMENDI:

H.R. 3193.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 3194.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 3195.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, sec. 8, cl. 3: To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. JOHNSON of Texas:

H.R. 3196.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 3197.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. LOUDERMILK:

H.R. 3198.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 3199.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 8

By Mr. MASSIE:

H.R. 3200.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This Act is justified by the lack of a mandate or assertion of authority in the United States Constitution for the federal government to establish the laws affected by this Act; by Article One of the United States Constitution that grants legislative powers; by the Second Amendment to the United States Constitution that recognizes the right

to bear arms, and by the Ninth and Tenth Amendments to the United States Constitution, which recognize that rights and powers are retained and reserved by the people and to the States.

By Mrs. BEATTY:

H.R. 3201.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution of the United States

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 3202.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. DEUTCH:

H.R. 3203.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution and Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. GRIJALVA:

H.R. 3204.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. I, §§1 and 8.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 3205.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, the necessary and proper clause

By Mr. KINZINGER:

H.R. 3206.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. LAMB:

H.R. 3207.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 3208.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. LEWIS:

H.R. 3209.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL:

H.R. 3210.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 3211.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 3212.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3213.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Section 8 of Article I: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

Amendment XVI: The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes on incomes, from whatever source derived, without apportionment among the several states, and without regard to any census or enumeration.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3214.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Equal Access to Justice for Victims of Gun Violence is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Ms. SHALALA:

H.R. 3215.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3

By Mrs. TRAHAN:

H.R. 3216.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 1.

All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States, which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 3217.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

“No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law)”

In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:

“The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States)”

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 23: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 35: Mr. HARDER of California and Mr. HUFFMAN.

H.R. 36: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. LEVIN of California.

H.R. 38: Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 51: Ms. SHERRILL, Mrs. MCBATH, and Mr. HECK.

H.R. 144: Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana.

H.R. 205: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 230: Ms. BASS.

H.R. 333: Mr. DEUTCH.

H.R. 336: Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 435: Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. HAALAND, and Ms. LEE of California.

H.R. 487: Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee.

H.R. 510: Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 541: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 561: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 586: Mr. PALAZZO and Mrs. MILLER.

H.R. 613: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 617: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 647: Mr. GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 663: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 712: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 724: Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. RUSH, and Mr. MARCHANT.

H.R. 728: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 737: Ms. ESCOBAR and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 748: Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 763: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 830: Mr. ROUZER.

H.R. 838: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Mr. GUEST.

H.R. 846: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 864: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 921: Mr. YARMUTH and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 945: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, Ms. SCANLON, and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 948: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 955: Ms. OMAR.

H.R. 961: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1002: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1042: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1043: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 1055: Mr. SWALWELL of California and Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 1080: Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. LEVIN of California, and Ms. BASS.

H.R. 1109: Mr. MAST and Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1128: Mr. KIND, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. MOOLENAAR, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1149: Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 1154: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico and Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 1156: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 1163: Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 1166: Mr. KIM.

H.R. 1174: Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 1175: Mr. GIANFORTE.

H.R. 1185: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 1186: Mr. MEEKS.

H.R. 1225: Mr. DESJARLAIS, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. SPANO, and Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 1236: Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 1257: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 1327: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. COOPER, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 1368: Mr. LUJÁN.

H.R. 1373: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. HIMES, and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1380: Ms. UNDERWOOD and Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 1395: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.

H.R. 1396: Mr. SARBANES, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. BRADY, Mr. CONAWAY, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. HURD of Texas, and Mr. MCCAUL.

H.R. 1400: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.

H.R. 1407: Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PRESSLEY, and Mr. PHILLIPS.

H.R. 1418: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 1446: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1452: Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 1497: Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. CASTEN of Illinois.

H.R. 1530: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1554: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 1568: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. TRONE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, Ms. LEE of California,

Mr. NEAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 1602: Mrs. LESKO.

H.R. 1605: Mr. CLINE and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 1607: Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 1610: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1662: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1679: Mr. ESTES.

H.R. 1692: Mr. PAPPAS and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1695: Mr. UPTON and Mr. COX of California.

H.R. 1696: Mr. KILMER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 1739: Mr. WATKINS.

H.R. 1740: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.

H.R. 1748: Mr. PAPPAS.

H.R. 1753: Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. RICE of South Carolina, and Mr. HUIZENGA.

H.R. 1754: Ms. UNDERWOOD, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 1764: Mr. ROUDA.
 H.R. 1768: Mr. NADLER.
 H.R. 1784: Ms. SCANLON and Mr. LAMB.
 H.R. 1789: Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 1837: Mr. FERGUSON and Mr. COSTA.
 H.R. 1840: Mr. DELGADO.
 H.R. 1850: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. ROUZER.
 H.R. 1882: Mr. RYAN and Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 1897: Mr. MCGOVERN and Ms. GABBARD.
 H.R. 1903: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
 H.R. 1923: Mrs. CRAIG.
 H.R. 1939: Ms. ESCOBAR.
 H.R. 1941: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 1975: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
 H.R. 1984: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 2013: Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 2048: Mr. PAPPAS.
 H.R. 2050: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 2053: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H.R. 2054: Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 2089: Mr. DEFazio.
 H.R. 2091: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
 H.R. 2098: Ms. MOORE and Ms. OMAR.
 H.R. 2147: Mr. CLOUD, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RICHMOND, and Mr. WATKINS.
 H.R. 2148: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. LUJÁN.
 H.R. 2149: Mr. ROSE of New York.
 H.R. 2151: Mr. NADLER and Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 2156: Ms. SCANLON and Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 2174: Mrs. WAGNER.
 H.R. 2200: Ms. PINGREE.
 H.R. 2201: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. DEFazio, Mr. AGUILAR, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.
 H.R. 2208: Mr. GRIJALVA.
 H.R. 2219: Mr. RESCHENTHALER.
 H.R. 2258: Mr. ESTES.
 H.R. 2266: Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 2313: Mrs. KIRKPATRICK.
 H.R. 2314: Mr. FOSTER and Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 2322: Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.
 H.R. 2327: Mr. LOWENTHAL.
 H.R. 2328: Ms. KELLY of Illinois and Miss RICE of New York.
 H.R. 2336: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 2344: Mr. BACON.
 H.R. 2350: Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. STEVENS, and Mrs. BUSTOS.
 H.R. 2354: Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 2368: Mr. CICILLINE.
 H.R. 2370: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 2382: Mr. CORREA, Mr. YOUNG, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. RIGGLEMAN, Ms. MOORE, Mr. WELCH, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. COSTA, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 2397: Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, and Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 2405: Ms. MOORE, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, and Ms. DELAURO.
 H.R. 2414: Ms. HAALAND.
 H.R. 2415: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. LUJÁN, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2420: Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 2424: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 2426: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. CASE, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. WALKER.
 H.R. 2433: Mr. PERRY.
 H.R. 2440: Mrs. HARTZLER, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STAUBER, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 2442: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
 H.R. 2443: Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. MARCHANT, and Mrs. LESKO.
 H.R. 2445: Mr. HUNTER.
 H.R. 2447: Mr. BURGESS.
 H.R. 2460: Mr. SPANO.
 H.R. 2498: Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 2528: Mr. SIRES, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. GRIJALVA, and Mr. MCGOVERN.
 H.R. 2569: Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SHALALA, and Mr. SABLÁN.
 H.R. 2573: Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. PASCRELL.
 H.R. 2647: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 2660: Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. PHILLIPS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mr. WELCH, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. RUSH.
 H.R. 2680: Mr. CÁRDENAS.
 H.R. 2698: Mr. COLE.
 H.R. 2739: Mr. CUELLAR, Mrs. CRAIG, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. BYRNE.
 H.R. 2746: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
 H.R. 2754: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 2764: Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 2767: Mr. DEUTCH and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 2790: Mr. LATTI, Mr. CRAWFORD, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. STEUBE, and Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
 H.R. 2791: Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 2797: Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 2803: Mr. LEVIN of Michigan.
 H.R. 2805: Mr. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 2822: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 2829: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
 H.R. 2831: Mr. HARDER of California.
 H.R. 2847: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.
 H.R. 2850: Mr. KILMER.
 H.R. 2853: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 2854: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
 H.R. 2859: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. GOLDEN.
 H.R. 2867: Ms. PRESSLEY and Mr. KIM.
 H.R. 2869: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
 H.R. 2897: Mr. KILMER and Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 2909: Mr. PAPPAS and Mr. QUIGLEY.
 H.R. 2912: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 2913: Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 2957: Mr. WRIGHT.
 H.R. 3006: Mr. WATKINS.
 H.R. 3010: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
 H.R. 3018: Mr. BEYER and Mr. SOTO.
 H.R. 3025: Mr. NORMAN.
 H.R. 3032: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 3038: Ms. SPEIER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Ms. HOULAHAN, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. STIVERS.
 H.R. 3051: Mr. STEUBE.
 H.R. 3068: Mr. HUFFMAN.
 H.R. 3106: Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
 H.R. 3125: Ms. SLOTKIN and Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 3153: Mr. WELCH and Mr. BALDERSON.
 H.R. 3182: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
 H.R. 3185: Mr. BACON, Ms. STEFANK, and Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H. Con. Res. 27: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.
 H. Res. 27: Mr. HASTINGS.
 H. Res. 60: Mr. TAKANO.
 H. Res. 152: Mr. PAPPAS.
 H. Res. 189: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. RYAN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H. Res. 231: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
 H. Res. 246: Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. MCADAMS, and Mr. ROUZER.
 H. Res. 255: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. BACON, and Mr. LAMBORN.
 H. Res. 364: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
 H. Res. 379: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H. Res. 395: Mr. MAST and Mr. STIVERS.
 H. Res. 398: Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. SMUCKER, and Mr. HARRIS.
 H. Res. 402: Ms. FINKENAUER.
 H. Res. 432: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, and Ms. JAYAPAL.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

27. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the County Council of Prince George's County, MD, relative to Resolution No., CR-33-2019, urging additional oversight for the purpose of urging the Board of Public Works to ensure that contracts with a total value that exceeds \$500 million, meet certain standards and benchmarks; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

28. Also, a petition of the County Council of Prince George's County, MD, relative to Resolution No. CR-32-2019, declaring opposition to any expansion of the Baltimore-Washington Parkway and any proposal to transfer the Baltimore-Washington Parkway from the National Park Service; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

29. Also, a petition of the Board of Supervisors of the City and County of San Francisco, CA, relative to Resolution No. 233-19, commemorating the 150th Anniversary of the completion of the Transcontinental Railroad; honoring the contributions of Chinese railroad workers for their significant contributions; and declaring May 10, 2019, and every May 10 thereafter, as Transcontinental Chinese Railroad Workers Day in the City and County of San Francisco; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

30. Also, a petition of the Senate of Puerto Rico, relative to Senate Resolution No. 1084, requesting the United States Congress to pass H.R. 2360 which seeks to establish a Renewable Energy Grant Program within the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) for the purpose of promoting renewable energy in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands for the United States of America; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture, Energy and Commerce, and Science, Space, and Technology.